



[Ray Geo. Harbor]
See note in H. & L.

10/15/1

12/1/1

present
constitutio
n, and the
Protestant
succession
vindicated
: in answer
to a late
book
entituled,
hereditary
right of the
crown of
England
asserted,
&c

44440146
59254



I Goodman

THE
HEREDITARY RIGHT
OF THE
Crown of England
ASSERTED;

THE
HISTORY of the SUCCESSION
since the CONQUEST clear'd;

AND THE
True *English* CONSTITUTION vindicated
FROM THE
MISREPRESENTATIONS
OF

Dr. Higden's View and Defence.

WHEREIN

Some MISTAKES also of our Common HISTORIANS
are rectify'd; and several Particulars relating to the Succession, and
to the Title of the House of *Suffolk*, are now first publish'd from
Ancient Records and Original MSS; together with an Authentick
Copy of King *Henry VIII.*'s Will.

By a GENTLEMAN.

*Ille, ut opes fractæ Teucrûm, & fortuna recessit,
Res Agamemnonias, victriciaque arma secutus,
Fas omne abrumpit. ----- Virg. Æn. 3.*

LONDON:

Printed by G. James, for RICHARD SMITH, at Bishop
Beveridge's Head in *Pater-Noster-Row*. MDCC XIII.

HARBIN

THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
ENGLAND

THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
ENGLAND
AND
THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
SCOTLAND

THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
ENGLAND
AND
THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
SCOTLAND

THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
ENGLAND
AND
THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
SCOTLAND

THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
ENGLAND
AND
THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
SCOTLAND

THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
ENGLAND
AND
THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
SCOTLAND

THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
ENGLAND
AND
THE
HEREDITARY
CROWN OF
SCOTLAND

CONTENTS.

T HE Doctrine of Allegiance due to Possession, when first publickly taught, and by whom refuted	pag. 1
Dr. Higden's three Reasons answer'd, by which he would clear that Doctrine from making Allegiance due to Cromwell	3
His Doctrine destroys the Hereditary Monarchy	10
The Monarchy of England prov'd to be Hereditary, by Prescription	11
By express Laws	14
The Doctor's Arguments from the Authority of Lawyers and Precedents briefly answer'd	16
His Argument from the Common Laws consider'd	19
He mistakes the true State of the Question	21
The People's Submission to such Kings as were not Heirs to the Crown by immediate Descent, is no Argument that Possession gives Right to Allegiance	ibid.
Whether the Kings of England had not anciently a Power of disposing of the Crown by Testament	22
However, the Consent and Cession of the Rightful Heirs were certainly sufficient to make such Kings Rightful	23
Submission might be pay'd them on one of those Accounts	24
William the Conqueror, in both those Regards, a Lawful King	ibid.
Edward the Confessor's Nomination of him for his Successor justified	26
The Right shewn to have been in Edward the Confessor	31
William Rufus also prov'd to have been a Lawful King	35
The same shew'd of Henry I.	37
His Usage of his Brother Robert not so cruel as many Histories represent it	39
King Stephen the first Usurper	42
No Footsteps of the Doctor's Principle in that Reign	43
Which was the most turbulent of any	45
Such as adher'd to him, did it not on the Doctor's Principle	46
The Earl of Gloucester own'd himself bound in Conscience to the Right of the Empress Maud	47
The King of Scotland suffer'd much in Defence of her Right	49
The Behaviour of the Clergy in that Reign	50
They made a Distinction between King Stephen, and a King de Jure	52
What Influence the Pope's pretended Power of Setting up Kings then had	53
Our Historians date Stephen's Right from his Agreement with Henry	54
Henry II. a Rightful King	55
It is most probable, his Mother had resign'd her Right to him	56
The Doctor's Argument, from a Passage in our Homilies, answer'd	60
A Defence of Bishop Merks against his Reflexions	64
[a]	No

CONTENTS.

No need of proving there were Non-jurors under Kings de Facto	69
That ought to be presum'd, till the contrary is prov'd	70
Instances of several, that ought to be reputed such	ibid.
The Clergy took no Oaths of Fealty before the Reformation	71
William the Conqueror not so generally sworn to, as the Doctor pretends	72
Several of the Nobility and Gentry left the Kingdom, rather than submit to him	73
Several of them were in Arms against Henry IV. on the same Account	ibid.
The Doctor's Mistake in asserting, that all the right Heirs of the Crown submitted to Henry IV.	74
Owen Glendor made War upon him for the Sake of the Right Heir	77
A Mistake of our common Histories concerning that Welsh Gentleman, rectify'd	80
The Percies also espous'd the Quarrel of the Right Heir against Henry IV.	81
A Vindication of them against the Doctor, out of a MS. Copy of Harding's Chronicle, Part of it never printed	ibid.
It was a prevailing Principle in that Age, that Actions done thro' Fear of Death, were excusable, if not lawful	88
Breach of Original Contract, charg'd by the Percies on Henry IV, may be justly charg'd on such Elective Kings	90
Archbishop Scroop join'd with the Earl of Northumberland against Henry IV, in Favour of the Right Heir	91
These great Men's Rising against him, was not Rebellion and Perjury, but Loyalty	92
The Blessings attending the Doctor's Constitution in that Reign	93
A Reflexion of Sir Walter Raleigh's to the same Purpose	94
The People's Submission to Henry V, not so universal as the Doctor makes it	95
Richard Duke of York's Claim against Henry VI. approved in Parliament	96
Edward IV. and his Parliament not blamable for calling Henry V, and Henry VI, Kings in Deed, and not of Right, notwithstanding their Oaths, and his	ibid.
Though the Oaths of Richard Duke of York, and his Son, to Henry VI, had ty'd them from claiming; yet this did not tye their Subjects	99
A King cannot resign without the Consent of the Three Estates	100
This Case is a most manifest Declaration in Favour of Right against Possession	102
Kings de Facto always fortify'd their Titles by the Pope's Approbation	104
The Doctor's Argument for Allegiance to such Kings from the pretended Allowance of the Kings de Jure themselves, consider'd	107
This Allowance cannot be inferred from the Discontinuance of Processes, &c. on the Demise of Kings de Facto	108
Nor from the Validity of their Grants, Licenses, &c. which were not so numerous as the Doctor pretends	110
Bagot's Case at large	111
Misrepresented by the Doctor	114
	His

CONTENTS.

<i>His Inferences wrong, both from the Plea of Bagot's Counsel</i>	116
<i>And from the Judgment given in Bagot's Favour</i>	118
<i>Which neither necessarily imply'd the Validity of Henry VII.'s Grants</i>	ibid.
<i>Nor did the Validity of that King's Grants imply the Allowance of his Authority</i>	119
<i>The Points of Law contain'd in the Plea of Bagot's Counsel, consider'd</i>	121
<i>Taken in the Doctor's Sense, they prove too much</i>	ibid.
<i>In their natural Sense, they prove too little</i>	124
<i>Sir Ralph Grey's Case consider'd, tho' overlook'd by the Doctor</i>	127
<i>This Case falsely reported in the Year-Books, as well as in Holinf-head</i>	129
<i>He was condemn'd, not in a Court of Common Law, but in a Court Martial</i>	130
<i>Kings de Jure have no where allow'd the Legislative Authority of their Predecessors de Facto</i>	132
<i>All the Acts of the Three Henries were held to be defective in Point of Authority, in the Reign of Edward IV.</i>	134
<i>Some of them sunk of themselves, upon his denying to confirm them</i>	138
<i>Others were declared void</i>	140
<i>Others confirmed, which the Laws of no Rightful King ever were, for want of Authority in the King</i>	144
<i>That of the 13 Car. 2. was confirm'd for want of Authority, not in the King, but in the Convention call'd without the King</i>	146
<i>Probably many more of the Henries Laws were confirm'd, than what the Doctor mentions</i>	ibid.
<i>That some more were confirm'd, is certain</i>	147
<i>That several of them, which do not appear to have been confirm'd, have yet the Force of Laws, is no Proof of the Authority of those that made them</i>	148
<i>A farther Argument, that the Validity of Laws does not always depend upon the Authority of the first Makers of them</i>	150
<i>Some of the Acts of the Three Henries may be allow'd to have been only voidable on Edward IV.'s Accession to the Crown</i>	153
<i>Others of them were actually void</i>	155
<i>Yet it was thought advisable also to declare them void</i>	ibid.
<i>Richard III.'s Laws no Argument of his Authority, though not annull'd by Henry VII.</i>	157
<i>Why they were not annull'd then, nor since</i>	158
<i>Henry VII. was Lawful King only in Right of his Queen</i>	159
<i>Not as descended from John of Gaunt</i>	160
<i>The Stat. of 1 H. 7. did not restore the Title of the House of Lancaster</i>	161
<i>The Argument from the Stat. of 11 H. 7. consider'd</i>	163
<i>That Statute, in the modern Sense of it, was needless, if Allegiance had been due to Possession by the Common Law</i>	ibid.
<i>It could not be intended for the Benefit of Kings de Facto and their Adherents</i>	164
<i>Henry VII. himself having attainted such, and their Attainders being unrepeal'd when this Act passed</i>	165
<i>The Doctor's Attainders by Parliaments ex post facto, unintelligible</i>	ib.
	Henry

CONTENTS.

Henry VII. design'd thereby only the Interest and Safety of his own Adherents	166
He could propose no Benefit from it to himself, but as King de Jure	ib.
Nor are the Words of the Act applicable to a King de Facto	169
They have never yet been determin'd to that Sense by any Judgment of Court	170
The Doctor's Argument from the Opinion of great Lawyers on this Statute, answer'd	171
The Case of the Lady Jane Grey consider'd	172
The Judges Opinion on that Case, that the Broad Seal of an Usurper was of no Authority, does not depend on that Lady's having been in Possession of the Throne	173
Yet her own Council assert, she was in full Possession; and Queen Mary herself seems to own it	ibid.
Nor are the Doctor's Observations from History against her Possession, so incontestable, as he imagines	175
On this Occasion he has plainly alter'd the State of the Question	176
Into what a narrow Compass he reduces the Services to be hoped from this Act	177
Which after all, was virtually repeal'd by King William	178
The Lord Chief Justice Hale's Judgment in the Case of the Lady Jane Grey	179
What Authority is to be attributed to the Opinion of Henry VIII.'s Judges, that the Crown takes away all Defects and Stops of Blood	180
That Maxim not universally true	ibid.
Acts done in Contempt of it are approv'd and commended in our Laws	182
The Right of the Legislature to limit the Succession, is no Argument that Allegiance is due to Kings de Facto	184
None of their Acts of Limitation have ever yet effectually excluded the next Heir by Proximity of Blood	185
Their Entails of the Crown upon the House of Lancaster did not keep out the House of York	ibid.
The Limitation of the Crown by Henry VIII.'s Will, in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, consider'd	186
His Will was admitted, executed, and published, as a legal and good Will	ibid.
Dr. Higden has not produced any Objection of Weight enough to render its Validity questionable	194
His Objections answer'd	195
A Censure of the Third Volume of the Complete History of England	200
Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, vindicated from the Charge of Polygamy	201
This Calumny, after it had been confuted, reviv'd in the Bishop of Sarum's History of the Reformation	202
The principal Nobility now living, that have the Honour to be descended from that Duke, and the French Queen	203
The House of Suffolk vindicated from this Asperson out of a MS. of Mr. John Hales	ibid.
What induc'd Henry VIII. to exclude the Scotch Line	208
Though Queen Elizabeth made it High Treason to deny this Power of Limitation in her Life-time, yet in Opposition to it, she discouraged the	

CONTENTS.

<i>The Suffolk Title, and made Way for the Family of Scotland to the Throne</i>	209
<i>The Doctor's Argument from the Succession of Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth consider'd</i>	212
<i>It is a Mistake, that these Queens had no other Title, than the 35 H. 8.</i>	213
<i>And that they could not be both Legitimate</i>	ibid.
<i>The Doctor's Authorities of our best modern Lawyers consider'd</i>	216
<i>My Lord Chancellor Bacon is against him in several of his Writings</i>	217
<i>Sir Edward Coke was not always for him</i>	218
<i>The Laws did not cease under Cromwell</i>	220
<i>My Lord Chief Justice Hale is also clearly against the Doctor, in his MS. History of the Pleas of the Crown</i>	221
<i>The Extract which proves this, is faithful, and supported by his other Writings</i>	225
<i>Our Laws themselves are against the Doctor's Constitution</i>	226
<i>So are our ancient Lawyers, particularly Sir John Fortescue, 232, 235</i>	
<i>And Dr. Morton, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Chancellor, and Cardinal</i>	233
<i>The Judges, &c. upon the Tryal of the Regicides declare, that Charles II. during his Exile, was King both de Facto and de Jure,</i>	236
<i>The Doctor's Argument from the Scriptures consider'd</i>	237
<i>This was Shimei's and Hushai's Plea for Absalom</i>	ibid.
<i>The Jews Submission to the Midianites, Moabites, and other Conquerors, does no Service to the Doctor's Constitution</i>	238
<i>Nor our Saviour's Resolution of the Case about paying Tribute to Cæsar</i>	241
<i>Which, in the Doctor's Sense, proves Allegiance to have been due to Cromwell</i>	242
<i>The Doctor's fruitless Attempts to evade this Consequence</i>	243
<i>The Parliament of Forty Two first set this Doctrine of Allegiance to a King de Facto in its true Light, and that upon the Stat. of 11 H. 7.</i>	245
<i>With what Contempt King Charles I. treated their new Exposition of that Statute</i>	249
<i>A like Declaration against it by Mr. Solicitor, afterwards Lord Chancellor Finch</i>	250
<i>Grotius's Exposition of that Text (Render to Cæsar, &c.) examin'd, and other different Expositions of it set down, which the Doctor has not refuted</i>	251
<i>Our Saviour does not here require the Jews to do more for Cæsar, than was consistent with the common Principles of Right and Justice</i>	253
<i>The Fact on which Grotius's Argument is founded, seems plainly to be mistaken</i>	254
<i>Grotius himself was not always of this Opinion</i>	255
<i>Which would have been so fatal to the Roman Empire, that if it had been Christian, that alone would have engag'd the Romans to extirpate Christianity</i>	256
<i>If it be a Christian Law, it is such as never had Authority in any Christian Nation</i>	258
<i>St. Ambrose, and the Christians of that Time, did not observe it with regard to Maximus, who was Emperor de Facto</i>	259
[b]	Whose

CONTENTS.

<i>Whose Laws and Edicts were all declar'd Null by Theodosius, as the</i>	
<i>Laws of Usurpers us'd to be by the Christian Emperors</i>	261
<i>Whether, if we suppose the Tribute-Money to have been coin'd by the</i>	
<i>Jews, that would not make our Saviour's Argument more intel-</i>	
<i>ligible</i>	ibid.
<i>Considerations that seem to favour this Conjecture</i>	262
<i>Which is farther countenanc'd by comparing it with that, which as-</i>	
<i>serts the Romans themselves to have coin'd this Tribute-Money</i>	265
<i>Another Conjecture, viz. that the Inscription on the Tribute-Money</i>	
<i>was Judæa Capta, consider'd</i>	ibid.
<i>The Authority of the Lex Regia vindicated against the Doctor</i>	267
<i>The Title of Tiberius prov'd from it</i>	268
<i>And from the Roman Historians</i>	269
<i>The Romans Rightful Governors of Judæa by the Submission of the</i>	
<i>Jews</i>	270
<i>However forcible that Submission is pretended to have been</i>	272
<i>The Judgment of two great Historians, for the Validity of Agree-</i>	
<i>ments submitted to by Force</i>	273
<i>The Jews submitted by Force to the Babylonians, and yet are con-</i>	
<i>demn'd for disobeying that Government</i>	ibid.
<i>The Conclusion</i>	274

Contents of the APPENDIX.

Numb. I. <i>A Passage out of Sir John Fortescue's Defence of the</i>	
<i>Title of the House of Lancaster</i>	Pag. i
Numb. II. <i>Proceedings of Richard Duke of York's Claim against</i>	
<i>Henry VI, &c.</i>	iii
Numb. III. <i>The Pope's Confirmation of Henry VIII.'s Marriage,</i>	
<i>and of his Title</i>	xvi
Numb. IV. <i>The Act for legitimating the Beaufort Family</i>	xvii
Numb. V. <i>A Letter from Queen Jane's Privy Council to the She-</i>	
<i>riff, &c. of Kent</i>	xviii
Numb. VI. <i>A Passage out of the Journal of the House of Lords, con-</i>	
<i>taining the Declaration of Henry VIII.'s Death, and the reading</i>	
<i>of a great Part of his Will to that House</i>	xix
Numb. VII. <i>Mr. J. Hales's Declaration of the Succession of the</i>	
<i>Crown</i>	xx
Numb. VIII. <i>An Authentick Copy of Henry VIII.'s Will</i>	xlii
Numb. IX. <i>A Passage out of my Lord Chancellor Ellesmere's Speech</i>	
<i>in the Exchequer-Chamber, touching the Postnati</i>	lix
<i>Sir Francis Bacon's Argument in the same Case; with some Refle-</i>	
<i>xions upon both</i>	ibid.
<i>The End of the Contents.</i>	

~~~~~

The READER is desir'd to correct the following ERRATA in the INTRO-  
DUCTION, with what others he may find in the Book.

PAG. 2. Marg. r. Seff. 2. c. 1. P. 4. Marg. r. 12 Car. 2. c. 12. P. 6. l. 7. r. Hen-  
ry IV. P. 8. l. ult. for can make, r. is necessary to make. P. 9. Marg. n. 1. r. Def.  
p. 137, 138. P. 11. Marg. (a) and (b) refer to Richard Rich, l. 10. And Def. p. 5.  
refers to He affirms, l. 12. P. 13. Marg. dele vide.

THE





# THE INTRODUCTION.



THE first Time that the Duty of Paying Allegiance to Powers in Possession began to be taught publickly in this Kingdom, was during the Usurpations, which succeeded the Death of King Charles I. Some Expressions to that Purpose had casually dropp'd from Lawyers, without examining the Question. In all former Revolutions, the Princes who got Possession of the Crown, claim'd it by some Right, and never insist'd on Possession, as Right. But the *Rump-Parliament*, and *Cromwell*, and the following Usurpers, having no tolerable Pretence to any Claim of Right, their Friends were reduced to a Necessity of pleading *Possession*, as a Right to Obedience; and several Books were then publish'd by (a) Papists, Fanaticks, and Deists, to enforce and prove it. But this Principle was then generally rejected, by all the Members of the *Church of England*, and by many *Presbyterians*, who maintain'd, that Allegiance was due to the rightful King, who was not in Possession; and several (b) Authors of both Com-munions wrote against, and refuted the Title of Possession.

AFTER the Restoration, the Acts, Orders, and Judicial Proceedings of the Governments preceding, were all null and void, except such as were authorized by a new Law: And it was declared by an (c) Act of Parliament, That all the said Powers before in Possession, were rebellious, wicked, traiterous, abominable Usurpations, detested by this present Parliament: And the Reason follows immediately, As opposite in the highest Degree to His Sacred Majesty's most just and undoubted Right, to whom and to His Heirs and law-

(a) Thomas White a Papist, Dr. Goodman, Baxter, Eaton, Afcham, Hobbes.

(b) *An Exercitation concerning usurped Powers: The Vindication of the Oath of Allegiance, in Answer to Sam. Eaton, Sanderson, Pryn, Lord Clarendon, Bramhal, Cumberland, Tennison, and all the Writers against Hobbes, and the University of Oxford, in the Judicium Oxoniense.*

(c) 12 Car. 2. ch. 12.



ful Successors, the Imperial Crown of the Realms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, with their and every of their Dominions and Territories, do of Right appertain; and as violating the just Rights and Privileges of Parliament. Here the Constitution was again resettled on its ancient Foundation; not on Possession, which all the Usurpers had; but upon the undoubted Right of the Lawful Heir, who had been out of Possession, and of his Heirs and lawful Successors, to whom it is here declared, that the said Dominions do of Right appertain. And agreeably to this Constitution, in that Reign it was the constant Doctrine of Lawyers and Divines, that Allegiance was not due to all Powers in Possession.

(d) Vide  
1 W. & M.  
ses. 2. c. 2.

THE Revolution that happen'd after, was begun, carry'd on, ended, and justified on these Grounds, That Allegiance was not due to all Kings in Possession: That King James was lawfully depriv'd: That King William and Queen Mary were lawfully put into Possession (d). But these Positions did not suit with the Principles of many Lawyers and Divines, who had constantly maintain'd, that the Deposition of a lawful King was absolutely unlawful by the Law of GOD, and the Laws of this Kingdom: Therefore, to justify the Translation of their Allegiance, the former Opinion, that seem'd buried at the Restoration, was reviv'd; viz. That Allegiance was due to all Powers in Possession; and many eminent Members of the Church of England receiv'd it, as consistent with the Doctrine of Non-Resistance: Divers Treatises were then publish'd by Divines and Lawyers, to defend it; of these the most celebrated were the Compositions of great Writers renowned in Controversy (e). The Unreasonableness of a new Separation, and the (f) Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers. The Instances of History and Parliament Records used in the first, were enquir'd into by an exact and faithful (g) Historian, and unanswerably refuted: The Arguments of the last from Scripture and Reason, the Doctrine of the Church, and the Laws of the Kingdom, were refuted likewise by several Writers; and no Reply of Moment being made, that Controversy seem'd to be buried again; but of late it hath had a second Resurrection.

(e) Stillingfleet.  
(f) Sherlock.

(g) Brady.

THE Reverend Doctor Higden thought fit, after many Years of Satisfaction, to examine the Dispute again; and



and having weigh'd in his Judgment the Arguments against Possession, found them to be light in the Balance; and was convinc'd, that Allegiance was due to Kings in Fact, by Law Divine and Humane: And to convince others, he drew *A View of the English Constitution*, and some time after, a *Review* to defend it against several Answers, in which his new Scheme had been thoroughly refuted. It hath happen'd in this *View*, and the Defence of it, as it usually does, when the Eye is fix'd attentively on one Object; that single Object is alone regarded and consider'd, and the many different Objects in the same View, are either not seen at all, or not distinctly. It will appear probable at least, to every one who reads the Doctor's two Treatises with Attention, that when he look'd into *English* Law and History, he had always his Opinion directly in his Eye; that he observ'd what was fit for his Purpose; and what was not, he overlook'd, or saw it through a bad Perspective. Thus having collected all the Materials he could find in Law and History, favourable to Possession, he rounded, and smooth'd, and shap'd them, by his own Glosses, to his own Opinion, which he presented to the World in Print, and call'd it *A View of the English Constitution*.

BUT it appears not, that the Doctor, with all his Diligence, hath found out any material Proof of his Constitution, which his Predecessors in this Controversy had omitted. He hath himself given us a (b) Summary of his Proofs, which had been all urg'd and answer'd before, by the Writers on this Subject, after the Revolution; and most of them had been pleaded by the Writers for Possession before the Restoration.

THE Doctor indeed endeavours to distinguish himself from the Advocates of those Usurpers, and particularly *Cromwell*, who had been often objected by his Adversaries: And (i) *once for all* he dispatches Oliver by three killing Reasons, which it may be fit here to examine.

THE first is, *That Oliver had not the Legislative Authority of the Kingdom, nor was ever acknowledg'd by our Kings to have had it; and therefore could not have the sovereign Authority of the Kingdoms.* He actually exercis'd all sovereign Power, Legislative, and Executive. By the Instrument of Government, (k) *The supreme Legislative Authority of the Kingdom was in his single Person, and the* People

(b) Preface  
to his De-  
fence.

(i) Defence,  
p. 106, 107.

(k) Dug-  
dale, *Short*  
*View*, p. 414.



(1) 1 Car.  
2. c. 12.

People in Parliament; but the Administration of it was left to the Lord Protector, and his Council, nominated by him. By his own Authority he made Scotland one Commonwealth with England; and he passed five Bills in his second Parliament: But his Legislative Power was never acknowledged by our Kings. His pretended Acts, on the contrary, were null after the Restoration. For what Reason? (1) The Law hath plainly declar'd it; because the Power that made those Acts was *Usurpation*, opposite to the undoubted Right of the King and his lawful Heirs, and the just Rights of Parliament. Will any one affirm, that the principal Reason of the Nullity of Oliver's Acts is none? or that they were null for want of a lawful Parliament, and not for want of a lawful King? Will any one say, the Law affirms this? On the contrary, the Law is plainly declarative of the true English Constitution, that to the Authority of Law is requir'd a lawful King, and a lawful Parliament; and the Want of the first is the chief Cause of the Nullity, because without the first the second cannot have Existence.

THE second Reason is, That Oliver, who had not the Regal Title and Office, could not have the Legislative Authority in this Monarchy, in which, by our Constitution, a Law cannot be made without a King or Queen; and therefore all the Acts of Oliver sunk of themselves, as Nullities ab Origine. As to the Name King, Oliver, when his Parliament offer'd it, denied to take it; but he took and executed the Office. The Name of King or Monarch denotes Sovereignty vested in a single Person, which Oliver really had, and was therefore really that, which those Words do signify; for he actually exercis'd Sovereignty in this Nation in a higher Degree, than did ever any of our Monarchs since the Conqueror. But is Allegiance due to a Sound, or Syllable? Is there any Law, that nulls the Acts of Kings, if they change their Style? If the King of England, whose Crown is Imperial, should assume the Style of Emperor, would all his Laws be null? Would he thereby forfeit his Crown Imperial? So he would, if he lost his Authority. Majesty was once as unknown to our Constitution, as Protector. The Kings of England were styled Lords of Ireland; yet as Lords, their Acts were valid; and when Henry VIII. took the Title of King, unknown to the Constitution of Ireland, were his Laws after-



afterward Null *ab Origine*? The Doctor is too judicious to insist on this Pretence for nulling the Acts of Oliver: If he had taken the Style of King, as he actually exercis'd the Office, his Authority and Right would have been still the same: The Usurping of a Word would not have made Legal all his other Usurpations; and it is morally certain, that if he had taken the Style of King, the Nation would not have acknowledg'd his Right to make Laws; and that after the Restoration, they would have sunk of themselves, as the Laws of an Usurper.

THE third Reason is, That *those only have been acknowledg'd for Kings for the Time being, who have been plac'd in the Throne by the States of the Realm, and recogniz'd by Parliament; whereas Oliver had not the Consent of the Three Estates; Two of the Three Estates, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, had been long before laid aside; and it was no better than a Mock-Representation of the Third Estate, that made him Protector.* To this it may be answer'd,

First, as before, That Oliver's Laws were Null, not because he was not advanc'd and recogniz'd by the States, but chiefly, because his Usurpation was opposite to the undoubted Right of the Lawful Heir. The Doctor's three Reasons are but one in Reality, (Title excepted) and one Reply is sufficient to confute them. But,

Secondly, There is no Law which declares, that *Kings for the Time being* must be necessarily plac'd in the Throne, and recogniz'd by Parliament. The Eleventh of Henry VII. makes no Mention of that Necessity; but supposes only in general, that Allegiance is due to the King for the Time being: The Words themselves imply only his Existence, not the Moral Causes, or Effects of it. And the Doctor hath cited no Authority of Law, nor produced any Reason to justify or support his Assertion: On the contrary 'tis notorious, that the Kings of England have Regal Authority, before a Parliament is called: Their Authority therefore is not the Product or Effect of Parliament.

Thirdly, Most of the Doctor's Kings in Fact were Kings in being for some time, before the Recognition of the Three Estates: It cannot be prov'd, That the Three Estates did constitute a Parliament, before the Middle or End of the Reign of Henry III. Henry V. Henry VI. Richard III. Henry VII. were Kings in being, and exercis'd



Regal Authority, before their Parliaments met: Thus Nine of the Doctor's Kings *de Facto* were not plac'd in the Throne by the States. Edward III. was set up by an Assembly, call'd and pack'd by an infamous Adulteress, when the King her Husband was in Prison. Richard II. was also in Prison, when the Parliament, call'd in his Name, depos'd him, and set up Henry I. 'Tis well known, who is *Caput, Principium, & Finis Parliamenti*: And the Doctor may please to resolve us, whether an Assembly is free, when the Head is imprison'd? and whether perfect Freedom is not necessary to a lawful Parliament?

Fourthly, Since Acts done without a Lawful Power, are Null *ab Origine*; the Doctor must allow, as he does, that the Three Estates have a Lawful Power to place a King on the Throne, as well as to recognize him, when he is plac'd: For if they have no such Power, their Placing a King is nothing; and cannot give Authority, which they have not. The Doctor understands not this of Placing Kings on the Throne, who have an Hereditary Right; but of Kings, who have it not: And then the necessary Consequence is, that the States have a Lawful Power of deposing Rightful Kings, to set up Kings *de Facto*; for they cannot place the one, without displacing the other. Thus one Parliament set up Edward III. by deposing his Father; and another, Henry IV. by deposing Richard. These two Powers have been always join'd in Fact, Dethroning, and Advancing; and if the Doctor will maintain, that the Three Estates have a Power to depose Lawful Kings, he may affirm it frankly; and he will find just as many Acts and Precedents for his Depositions, as for his Promotions: But if he will maintain, that the States have a Lawful Power to place a King on the Throne; but not to depose a Lawful King; he will maintain (with Submission be it said) a manifest Contradiction: For if the Deposition of a Lawful King, for want of Moral Power, is Unlawful and Null; he remains, as he was, a Lawful King, endu'd with Lawful Authority; but he hath no Authority, and is not Lawful, if another King is Lawfully plac'd on the Throne by the States, and invested with Lawful Authority: To create one King, is to destroy the other: Therefore they who have not a Power of Destroying, have none of Creating; and if they



they will create, the Being they produce is Morally Nothing. In the Doctor's Opinion, *Charles II.* when disposseſ'd, was Actually and Lawfully King, because *there was no King in Possession against him.* Does he think King *Charles* would have quitted the Regal Title, if *Oliver* had assum'd it? Be it so; but suppose the States conven'd had recogniz'd *Oliver*, as King; in that Instant, in the Doctor's Opinion, he would have had Regal Authority, and King *Charles* would have been deprived of it. But how could he have lost it in an Instant? By the States Authority of deposing him, of advancing and recognizing *Oliver.* Let any one, let the Doctor himself vouchsafe to consider well the Case, and give a tolerable Resolution of it. 'Tis this; One Week the States depose a Lawful King; the next they place Another on the Throne; the third they recognize him: The Difficulty is, how have the same States a Lawful Power to recognize and promote, if they have none to depose? 'Tis in vain to distinguish without a Difference; it seems absurd to make the same Power Null when it pulls down, and, when it sets up, Valid. Resistance, Deposition, Promotion, Recognition begin, advance, and finish Revolutions. Consent of the States and People legitimate All, or Nothing. The proper Way therefore of resolving Difficulties, is to begin with the first Acts; to examine whether Resistance and Deposition are lawful; then to consider, whether Subjects (such are the Three Estates) have a Moral Power, by their own Consent, to discharge themselves from their Allegiance to one King, and to give Regal Authority to another: If their Consent absolves them, they have a Lawful Power of Deposing; if not, their Consent is unlawful, and void; and hath no Moral Operation: It can neither deprive one King of Regal Authority, nor confer it on another.

Fifthly, Since the Law hath declared, (a) *That neither both, nor either of the Houses of Parliament, have a Legislative Power, without the King;* it is hard to understand, how the Three Estates can give a Legislative Authority, which they have not, to a King, who hath it not; and that their Consent, which is no Law, can make a Law-giver, and become a Law to all the Subjects, by laying the Obligation of Allegiance on them. Hitherto Men have been persuaded, that the Effect can have no more Power,

*Defence, p. 118.*

(a) 13 Car. 2. c. 1.



Power, than the Cause; and that none can give that, which he hath not.

*Sixthly*, Whereas Sovereignty is deny'd to *Oliver*, because he *had not the Consent of the Three Estates* of the Realm; this may raise another Difficulty: For if one of the Estates is excluded, (as in a Neighbouring Kingdom) then it seems, in the Doctor's Opinion, that a King so made hath in that Kingdom no Right to Sovereignty, and is not truly a *King for the Time being*: The Constitution, as to the Three Estates, in both Kingdoms, was the same; and it is hard to find a Reason, why if one Estate is lawfully excluded, so may not another; the Temporal, as the Spiritual Peers; for both have the same Right by the Constitution; and if Two of the Three may be excluded, so a Part of the Third, and so another Part, till the Three Estates are brought to a Rump, which may be also lessen'd, and at length wholly excluded; and so this Tail of a Distinction, by plucking out all the Hairs, will be reduced to nothing.

*Seventhly*, Tho' *Oliver* had not the Consent of the Three Estates Lawfully assembled, yet all the Estates, and the whole Body of the Kingdom liv'd quietly and peaceably under him; paid him Taxes; receiv'd Justice and Protection from him. He affirmed in a Speech to his first Parliament, That the Army, the City of *London*, all the Judges, Sheriffs, and Justices of Peace, the Grand Juries of several Counties, *nay all the People of England* had own'd him. The Majority of the Knights, Citizens, and Burgeses, elected by the People in his two Parliaments, sign'd a Recognition of him: His Establishment was so notorious, that all the Princes and States of *Europe* acknowledg'd him by Ambassadors. What follows? If the main diffusive Body of the People of *England* own'd him; this is surely equivalent to any Recognition of the Body Representative, or of the Three Estates; and the Whole being greater than a Part, the Authority of the Whole is greater in Proportion: The Consent of a whole People is of greater Value, than the Consent of a Senate. But it cannot be deny'd, that it confers at least as much Authority, according to the Law of Nature, and the Practice of Nations; and the Law of *England*, as is said, hath no where declar'd, That the Consent of Parliament can make *Kings for the Time being*,



being, or that in King-Making the Representers have more Authority, than the Body represented.

*Eighthly*, The Doctor himself, who excludes Oliver, because he had not the Consent of the Three Estates, hath employ'd two Chapters in his *View*, and as many in his *Defence*, to prove, that Subjection is due to Sovereign Power in Possession, by our Saviour's Decision about Tribute, and by the great *End and Design* of Government. He saith, that our LORD doth determine the Lawfulness of Subjection to the Roman Emperor, for this one Reason; namely, that he was in Possession of the Government. Subjection here must signify the whole Duty of a Subject to a Sovereign; or it signifies Nothing in this Dispute: And thus had Oliver a good Title to it; for he coin'd Money, and was as much in Possession of Sovereignty in Britain, as in Rome Tiberius. And King Charles in Exile could not afford the Subjects of England any of the Benefits of Government; he could neither defend himself, them, nor his Right to govern them. The Subjects therefore, according to the Doctor, were discharg'd from their Allegiance to the King who could not, and were bound to pay it to the Protector, who could, and did protect them. And if this is agreeable to the great *End and Design* of Government, it is agreeable to the Law of Nature. Suppose then, that Allegiance was not due to Cromwell by the Law of England; it was due by the Will of GOD, Natural and Reveal'd; by the Command of CHRIST, and the Laws of Nature; Laws superiour to the Law of England. If the Eternal Word hath spoken and decided, what Need of consulting the Oracles of English Law? If the Law Eternal of all Government requires Allegiance to Possessors, what Need of the Three Estates to Authorize it? Possession alone suffices; and according to the Doctor, Allegiance was due to Cromwell, for this one Reason; namely, that he was in Possession of the Government.

Thus it appears, that the Doctor, against his own Reasons, gives Cromwell a Right to Subjection; and it appears not, that his Three Reasons have dispatch'd him: His Usurpation is still in full Force against the Doctor's System, and evidently refutes it; for if it requires Allegiance to Cromwell, to every one that gains Possession; it must be confessed, that the Royalists, who adher'd to the King against Oliver, were Rebels against the Ordinance



nance of GOD, were Transgressors of the Law of Nature, and the Command of CHRIST; and that there never was, nor can be any Usurpation; for that implies Possession, which, according to the Doctor, is a Divine Right to Government.

BUT the true State of the Controversy between the Doctor and his Adversaries, is, whether the Kingdom of *England* be, of Right, Hereditary? or, whether it belongs, of Right, to every one, who gets Possession? whether *the Kingdom appertains to Lawful Heirs, or Actual Possessors?* The Distinction between Possessors by Force, and by Consent, hath no Ground in Fact and History; for all Possessors, not Hereditary, have been always set up by Force; Consent of States and People hath followed; and it is morally impossible, it should be otherwise: They who promote, aid, or gain by a Revolution, will consent willingly, and all others by Necessity; tho' in all Invasions of Sovereignty in *England*, the Majority of the Nation hath been against them; yet the Less Party being stronger by the Possession of Power, hath forc'd the Consent of the Greater. Consent therefore is the Effect, not the Cause of Possession; which cannot be made Morally Good by the Evil it produces; nor cease to be Evil, as long as it is Invasion of the Undoubted Right of the Lawful Heir. The only Question therefore is, Whether Inheritance, or Possession, is by the Constitution the true Right to the *English* Monarchy?

*Preface to  
Defence, p. 8.*

'Tis true, the Doctor acknowledges in plain Words, That the Crown is Hereditary; and he denies it to be Elective: But what Kind of Inheritance can he mean consistently with himself?

First, He asserts, that the *Inheritance may be limited by Parliament*. This I will not dispute; but it follows, that it is an Inheritance which may be taken from one, given to another, as often as the Parliament pleases; which seems to be an Inheritance very different from what is usually understood by Hereditary Monarchy; for it is truly Elective, since the Parliament chooses, or may choose the Successor always: And it is more Elective here, than in other Elective Kingdoms; for in all others the Elected have a Right for Life; in this a new one may be elected every Session.

Secondly,



Secondly, He maintains farther, That a King plac'd on the Throne by the States of the Realm, is a True and Lawful King for the Time being. He requires not, that his King should be of the Royal Family; he plainly declares, That if Cromwell had had, what he had not, the Consent of the Three Estates, he would have been, what he was not (a), a King for the Time being, with Legislative Power. Thus the Two Houses, without a King, can choose to this Hereditary Kingdom, and place on the Throne what Person they please, Richard Rich, Oliver Cromwell, or one of any other Family.

Def. p. 107.

Def. p. 104.

(a) The Doctor cites Sir T. Moore, who affirm'd, in a ludicrous Discourse with Rich the Solicitor, that the Parliament can make a King, and depose him, and could make Richard Rich a Lawful King. Defence, p. 5.

Thirdly, He affirms, (b) That either Queen Mary, or Queen Elizabeth, one or both, were Illegitimate, and yet had a Lawful Title. But (c) a Bastard is of Blood to none in Law, Nullius Filius, and therefore cannot Inherit. Thus, according to the Doctor, this Hereditary Crown is the Lawful Inheritance of those, who in Law have no Father, and therefore cannot Inherit.

(b) See Herb. Comp. Hist. Vol. 2. p. 183.

(c) Sir Hen. Finch, second Book of Law; p. 117.

Fourthly, He affirms farther, That it is our Saviour's Doctrine, that Subjection is due to Possession, and by the Law of Nature to Protection: The Hereditary Kingdom may therefore be Rightfully enjoy'd by a Commonwealth, a Rump, a Committee of Safety, or any other Power, that can get Possession, and afford Protection. Such is the Doctor's Hereditary Crown; if we collect his scatter'd Limitations, 'tis an Inheritance subject to perpetual Election of a King and Parliament, of the Two Houses alone; it may go to any Family, to no Heirs, to a Commonwealth, to any Power whatsoever.

THE Doctor, in his Views, could not avoid seeing evident Proofs, that the Crown of England was Hereditary; therefore he acknowledg'd it Verbally, and deny'd it Really, as utterly destructive to his System of Possession. He may understand Words as he pleases: But all other Writers of all Nations, and the Generality of all Men, understand by an Hereditary Crown, a Monarchy entail'd on one Family, and descending successively to the Lineal Heirs of it. Such are the Monarchies of France, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Denmark, Hungary, and all other Hereditary Dominions in the World; such is the English Monarchy, govern'd successively above Nine Hundred Years by the same Royal Family, which (saith

a great



Stillington,  
Orig. Brit.  
Pref. p. 72.

a great Author) *I believe hath the Advantage, in Point of Antiquity, above any other in Europe, and, as far as we know, in the World.* But if the most ancient Hereditary Family in the World, hath not a true Right of Inheritance; if Prescription of Nine Hundred Years is Nothing against new Possessors; there is surely no Right to Government at all, nor any true Right of Inheritance, Publick or Private; but every thing is every Man's; and Right, Prescription, Property, are Sounds without Signification.

BUT there have been many Interruptions in this Lineal Succession; some of them were made by the Cession of the next Heir; others by Testaments, which were thought to give a Lawful Right; others by Conquest; and others by a false Pretence of Inheritance: But Right hath been always pretended; and all notorious Violations of Right were condemn'd at the Time by all good Men, and rejected after by the whole Nation; which hath always restor'd the Rightful Heirs, as soon as it could shake off the Yoke of Conquerors and Intruders. The Species of Things is determin'd by their constant Nature, not by accidental Changes, how frequent soever; There have been many Changes in the Succession of *England*: Armies have set up Kings, who had no Right of Inheritance; Parliaments have confirm'd them; other Armies have dethron'd; other Parliaments have attainted them; and have declared the Entails of Parliaments Null. There have been divers Temporary Constitutions, if so they may be call'd; as the Constitution of Conquest, of Kings by Election, of Sovereignty in the Two Houses, of a Commonwealth, and lastly, of Protectors; every Power in Possession hath been the Constitution. But the Seeds of these Constitutions fell upon a Rock; forthwith they sprung up and flourish'd; but because they had not Root, they wither'd away; none of them liv'd so long, as to gain the Title of Prescription; one or two grew up to Maturity, and died; the rest perish'd in their Infancy. The Tree of Hereditary Right hath been several Times cut down to the Ground; *but the Stump of the Roots in the Earth hath grown up again, and hath reached unto Heaven. The Kingdom hath been sure, and the Nation hath been convinc'd, that the Heavens do rule.*

AFTER



AFTER the Norman Conquest, when the Government was quietly settled under Henry I; all the great Men of the Kingdom bound themselves by Oath, to the Succession of *Maud* his only Heir, to whom alone (as a good Historian affirms) the *Lawful Succession* was due from her Grandfather, Uncle, and Father, all Kings; and from her Mother's Race for many Ages past. By her Right succeeded Henry II. her Son, from whom all the Royal Family is descended; and He and all his Successors, for above Five Hundred and Fifty Years, have enjoy'd or claim'd the Crown by Hereditary Right; even those who had it not, did claim it; as *John*, *Henry IV*, *Richard III*, *Henry VII*: which seems an evident Proof, that our Constitution is Inheritance. In Morality 'tis thought a good Proof of the Natural Distinction between Right and Wrong, that the Worst of Men pretend to Justice, and would prefer Right, if by it they could compass their Desires: There have been often Competitors in *Poland*; about the Right to the Kingdom; All have claim'd by Election: The Constitution of *Poland* is therefore Elective. The Kings of *England*, who had not Hereditary Right, have claim'd it for many Ages; never was any King in *England*, who would not have prefer'd Hereditary Right to all other Titles; the Constitution of *England* is therefore Hereditary: But if Possession is Right; Birthright, and all other Rights are Songs and Fables.

Malmsh.  
Hist. Novell.  
f. 99. n. 40.  
Cui soli Legitima debeat successio, ab Avo, Avunculo, Patre, Regibus, & a materno genere multis retrō seculis.  
Vide.

BUT if Prescription of Nine Centuries, if the continual Claim of Five Hundred and Fifty Years be nothing; what other Proof can be found more convincing? These Titles are indisputable in all other Hereditary Dominions; and a hard Undertaking it is, to persuade those, who will not be persuaded. However, reasonable Men may bear it, if Attempt is made to convince them by a Novel Law, and a Modern Constitution.

ALL Hereditary Titles, that were ever Receiv'd in this Island, were united in the Person of King *James I*. The Three Estates in Parliament acknowledging this to be an *inestimable, and unspeakable Blessing*, with the *Sacrifice of their unfeigned and hearty Thanks to Almighty God*, and upon the *Knees of their Hearts*, with this and much more Preamble, they humbly agnize the King's Indubi-

Act of Recognition,  
1 K. James,  
c. 1.



table Right, and their own *most constant Faith and Obedience to his Majesty, and his Royal Progeny.*

THEY declare, *That immediately on the Decease of Queen Elizabeth, the Imperial Crown of England did descend to his Majesty.*

THEY acknowledge, *That his Right to the Crown is Inherent Birthright, and Lawful Succession, as being Lineally, Justly, and Lawfully next, and Sole Heir of the Blood Royal of this Realm.*

To this Right they *faithfully submit, and oblige themselves, their Heirs, and Posterities for ever, until the last Drop of their Bloods (their own, and all their Heirs for ever) be spent.*

THEY beseech his Majesty to accept the same, *as the first Fruits, in the High Court of Parliament, of their Loyalty and Faith to his Majesty, and to his Royal Progeny, and Posterity for ever.*

THEY preface all this by affirming, *That they are bounden thereunto by the Laws of God and Man.*

To put out of all Doubt the perpetual Obligation of this Law, in the Intention of the Legislators, they enact it, *as a Memorial to all Posterities, among the Records of Parliament for ever to endure.*

WHAT Law for the Declaration of Right can be found, in all the Codes and Pandects of the World, more express, more full, and comprehensive? How could they bind more strongly, themselves to the King, their Heirs to his Heirs, their Posterity to his Posterity for ever? They make the Hereditary Right, and the Obligation of the Subjects to it, as far as they can, immutable, and eternal: They affirm, it is establish'd by Law Divine, and Humane: The Right to the Crown is not Possession with or without Consent; it descended to King James before Possession, at the Instant the Queen died; so it is to descend by this Law to his Heirs for ever: The true Right is (not Possession, but) Inherent Birthright, Lineal Succession. Other Persons were then living, of the Royal Family; but the Next is declar'd to be the Sole Heir: The Crown is appropriated to the Next Heirs of the Royal Family for ever: The Three Estates vow Obedience and Loyalty to the King, and his Heirs by Lineal Descent; they debarr themselves and their  
Posterity



Posterity from paying it to Others: They devote their own Blood, the *last Drop* of it, and all the Blood of their Heirs, to maintain the Lawful Succession against all Opposers: And to this Eternal Duty they are bound *by the Laws of God and Man*. The Vows and Acts of Fathers are suppos'd to bind their Posterity: The Three Estates presume, that they have a Power to bind Theirs; They affirm in this Recognition, That *the Court of Parliament is the whole Body of the Realm*; The Politic Body is the same Now as it was then; and every Member of it hath in Effect made the same Recognition; so that this Act, till the Society hath revok'd it Lawfully, lays the same Obligation on every Member of the Society, as if he had Personally consented to it. This Act is an Original Contract, made with the First King of this Line, and with his Posterity; the whole Nation obliges itself therein to the Heirs of this Family for ever; if before this Act of Recognition there were Disputes about the Right of Succession, here they are ended: After this Law, there cannot be any reasonable Dispute, to whom *the true Duty of Allegiance* is due, by all *Laws, Reason, and good Conscience*; for here it is declared, That the Three Estates, and all the Realm, are *bound by the Laws of God and Man*, to pay it to the Lawful Heir in the Order of Succession. 11 Hen. 7.  
c. 1.

AND here it may be remembred, that the Right of Inheritance, established so fully in this Act of Recognition, is again more briefly, but as effectually declared in the Act of *Charles II.* wherein it is affirmed, in Opposition to all Usurpations, That the Imperial Crown of these Realms, appertains by *Just and Undoubted Right*, to the King, and to his Heirs and Lawful Successors. As the undoubted Right was in King *Charles*; so after him in his Lawful Heirs: As the Crown appertain'd by Law to him, when he was out of Possession; so it must be understood to belong to his Heirs and Lawful Successors, if they should be out of Possession also. By the Act of King *James*, Birthright is declar'd to be the perpetual Right to the Crown: In this Act of *Charles II.* it is affirm'd to be the undoubted Right, even when others are in Possession. Neither of these Acts are expressly repeal'd; and both together seem to make an impregnable Proof, that Hereditary 12 Car. 2.  
c. 12.



tary Right was by Law the only Right to the Crown of England.

(a) *Speech of the Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, touching the Postnati,*  
p. 36.  
(b) *Ibid.*  
p. 68.

(c) *Ibid.*

p. 99, &c.

(d) *Lord Ellesmere and Sir Francis Bacon,*  
See Appendix, No<sup>o</sup> ix.

AGAINST the positive Determination of Law, 'tis in vain to object the Pleadings of Apprentices in Law, and even the Sayings of great Lawyers, disprov'd by great Lawyers, and contradicted by themselves in their undoubted Works. In a great Case debated and resolved by a Lord Chancellor and Twelve Judges, (a) the Rules of Succession, in Cases of the Crown, are cited as known Principles and Maxims of the Common Law, against which there never hath been, nor ought to be any Dispute. Descent is affirm'd to be an (b) undoubted Title made by Law; And Allegiance is declared to be due, not to the (c) Crown or Kingdom, but to the King, even when he is (d) driven out of his Kingdom. If Lawyers notwithstanding will contradict the Principles of Law, the Right of Descent, and Duty of Allegiance, can their Contradiction destroy them? The Sayings and Sentiments of Lawyers must be judged of by Law, which is the adequate Rule of Moral and Civil Action; and if Law is not a clear Rule about the Right to Sovereignty, this Dispute can have no Determination; the Opinion of Lawyers can neither indemnify Men in this World, nor secure them from Damnation in the other.

Much less is this Controversy to be determin'd by Facts and Precedents, which, how frequent soever, must be justified by Law: For Actions are not Lawful, because they are done and recorded; but because they are conformable to Law: And it is certain, that Injustice, publick and private, hath more Precedents, and fills History more, than Right and Justice. King Stephen enjoy'd the Kingdom by Perjury, Fraud, and Violence; Edward II. was depos'd, and cruelly murder'd; Edward III. a Minor, was set on his Father's Throne before his Time; Henry IV, contrary to his Oaths, and his Engagements with his own Party, depos'd and murder'd his Sovereign, and assum'd his Crown; Richard III, besides many other Horrible Murders, kill'd the King and his Brother, and took their Inheritance; Henry VIII. fix'd and unfix'd the Succession, as suited his Lust and Pleasure: A Parliament rais'd a Rebellion against the best of our Kings, by his

own



own Authority; a Part of it Depos'd and Murder'd him: A Commonwealth was set up; and an Officer assum'd the Sovereignty, and transmitted it to his Son and Heir: These were Impious and Tragical Actions, of which the Actors have been, and are, and will be condemn'd, by all good Men for ever. Dr. *Higden* cannot possibly approve them; yet by several of these, and such Precedents as these, He justifies his Opinion, *That Possession with Consent is Right*: Tho' the Possession hath been extremely wicked, and the Consent to Wickedness extreme Iniquity. He could find no Precedents, in which there was not a long Chain of Wickedness; Perjury, Rebellion, Invasion, Deposition, Murder, and Possession; he hath collected out of History the greatest Crimes, and call'd them the Constitution: The Bulk of his Proof is, That there have been unjust Possessions, justify'd by Pretence of Consent and Law, which ever have been, and will be the Effects of unjust Power and Possession. A Divine might have consider'd, what hath been often urged, and seems unanswerable; That Unjust Possession obliges to Repentance and Restitution: And that no Man can have a True Right to what he is bound to Restore; nor can others be oblig'd to Maintain him in it.

THE Doctor, no doubt, had read and consider'd *The true and exact History of the Succession*. If that History is not what it pretends to be, the Doctor would have oblig'd the World by refuting it; but if it be really *true and exact*, as it is generally esteem'd to be; it is undoubtedly a full Refutation of the Doctor's Opinion: Here it hath been Attempted to prove, that his Opinion makes the most unjust Possession (as was *Oliver's*) rightful; and destroys the Hereditary Right, so long Establish'd by the Constitution; and if the Doctor hath not sufficiently guarded his Opinions against these Objections, they seem evidently to Overthrow it.

By Dr. Brady, printed An. 1681.

BUT because Books not particularly Answer'd, are boasted as Unanswerable: And because it may be of Service to the Publick, and to Truth itself, to vindicate our Law and History from the Mistakes

## INTRODUCTION.

of the Reverend Doctor, the Author of the following Work hath taken the Pains to follow him thro' all his Labyrinth: And, to make the Way thro' it more easy, he hath examin'd, in the Order of Time, all the Historical Facts produced by him; hath refuted his Arguments and Comments upon them, and rectify'd his Errors about the *English* Constitution: And the best Commendation of this Treatise is, to desire the Reader impartially to examine it.



THE





THE  
HEREDITARY RIGHT  
OF THE  
Crown of England  
ASSERTED, &c.



THE Doctor's Design is to prove, That, by the *Constitution* of *England*, whoever is fully possess'd of the Crown and Government of it, has an undoubted Right thereby to be acknowledg'd and obey'd as a Lawful King; that is, he manifestly affirms, That whoever is King *de Facto*, is by Consequence King *de Jure* too. And in his first Chapter, he undertakes the Defence of this Doctrine, from the known Customs, and uninterrupted Practices; that is, from the *Common Laws* of the Realm. Let us now see, how he manages his Argument. *The People of England* (saith he) *always submitted and took Oaths of Fidelity to the Thirteen Kings, who from the Conquest to King Henry VII. came to the Throne without Hereditary Titles, as well as to the Six Hereditary Kings, who reigned in that Period; and this so universally, that I don't know, there are any Non-Jurors to be found in those Reigns.*

By *Hereditary Kings*, it is here evident, the Doctor means only such, as held the Crown by *Proximity of Blood*; and consequently by those, whom he affirms to have had no *Hereditary Right*, we are to understand such, as placed



(a) See his  
Charter in  
Dr. Hickes's  
Dissert. Epist.  
p. 72.

(b) See his  
Charter in  
Mr. Selden's  
Notes on Ead-  
merus, p. 211.

(c) P. 200.

(d) L. 2. p.  
492.

(e) P. 21.

placed themselves in the Throne, when others, who had a nearer Relation to it by Descent, were living. But the Doctor should have known, that the Word *Hereditary* had a different Signification, than what he has assign'd to it, in our Ancient Writings. For *William the Conqueror* (a) styles himself King *Edward's Heir*; and calls the Crown of *England* his *Inheritance*: And his Son King *Henry I.* (b) affirms, That his Father succeeded by Right of Inheritance; and the same Assertion may be met with in (c) *Guil. Piſtaviensis*, and (d) *Ordericus Vitalis*. Why therefore must the *Conqueror* be expunged out of the List of Hereditary Kings, when there is so good Authority to keep him in? Surely He very well knew, as did the Historians cited upon this Occasion, that he was not the next of Kin to King *Edward*; and yet we see, they did not think it an Absurdity to maintain his *Hereditary Title*: Nor certainly is the Doctor ignorant, that many of his Friends have lately taken it very ill, that the Word *Hereditary* should be appropriated only to such, as succeed by *Proximity of Blood*. The Truth is, a Successor by *Will* is an *Heir* in the Language of the *Civil Law*; and therefore *William the Conqueror*, claiming by the *Testament* of King *Edward*, might justly be said to have an *Hereditary Title*: But this is a Point I shall not much contend for; and therefore if the Doctor thinks fit to insist upon it, I am willing to allow him his Catalogue of Non-Hereditary Kings, in the Sense he is pleased to understand that Expression: But then he must pardon me, if I think this Concession will do him no manner of Service. For it is here proper to remember, what the Doctor thought fit for his Purpose to acknowledge in his (e) *Defence*; That the Question between him and his Adversaries, is about the *Duty of Subjects*, whether they are to pay their *Allegiance* to all Princes, that can fix themselves in the Throne, or only to those, who are Lawful Kings, independently of their Possession. The first they deny; and the latter only they think capable of a Defence: But surely they do not allow it to be a just Consequence from this Position, That they must never submit to Princes, whose Titles are not supported by *Priority of Birth*, or *Nearness of Blood*; which yet the Doctor takes for granted, and builds upon, as an uncontested Principle



Principle throughout this whole Controversy: I must beg Leave therefore to say, that he has very inauspiciously, at the Entrance of his Discourse, mistaken the true State of the Question; for instead of proving, that the People of *England* have all along own'd the Authority of Princes, who had no other *Title*, but what they deriv'd barely from Possession; which was his only proper and necessary Business; he has been pleas'd to amuse his Reader with an Assertion (the Truth of which was never yet called in Question) That many of our Kings, since the Conquest, were generally esteem'd *Rightful Successors*, tho' they were not the next Heirs, by Blood, to the Crown.

I WOULD explain myself a little more particularly upon this Article; because I find it has been thought of Moment by the Friends to the Doctor's Hypothesis. He is pleas'd to affirm, *That the People of England always submitted and took Oaths of Fidelity to the Thirteen Kings, who, from the Conquest to Henry VII. came to the Throne without Hereditary Titles*; that is, who were not Heirs by immediate Descent to the Crown; and from thence he draws this Conclusion, That whoever is in the Throne, has, for that sole Reason, though he should be destitute of all other Pleas and Pretences, a sufficient Right to the Obedience of the Subjects. But surely this Consequence cannot possibly be admitted; unless it is also evident, that where a Title by Birth is wanting, that Defect can no otherwise be supplied, but by *Possession*: For if it should appear, that much better Reasons may be assign'd for this Obedience, which was paid to the Doctor's Non-Hereditary Kings; he will then be forced to confess, that his Argument has fallen short of his Purpose. I would therefore intreat him to consider, *First*, Whether in this *Hereditary* Monarchy of *England*, there was not anciently a Power in the Crown, to interrupt and limit the Lineal Succession, by the Exclusion of the Right Heir. *Secondly*, Whether the Consent and Cession of the *Rightful* Heirs, are not sufficient to convey a Right to Princes, who wanted a Title by Proximity of Blood. And then, *Thirdly*, Whether it is not possible, that the general Submission and Obedience, which was paid to several of those Thirteen Kings, who are said by the Doctor to have had no Hereditary

G

Right,



Right, might be the sole Effect of these Motives and Principles.

*First*, I ask, Whether in this *Hereditary Monarchy of England*, there was not anciently a Power in the Crown, to interrupt the Lineal Succession, by the Exclusion of the *Right Heir*? The Doctor makes no Question, but this has been an undoubted Part of the Prerogative of our Modern Kings, with the Consent of Parliament; and assures us, (f) it was a Doctrine universally admitted by all Parties in *Henry VIII's*, and *Queen Elizabeth's Reigns*. Now I look upon this as a good Ground for *Presumption*, that their Predecessors had the same Authority; for there is Reason to believe, that whatever considerable Branches of Sovereignty have been exercis'd by Princes in these latter and declining Ages of the Monarchy, were as amply at least, if not in a more eminent Degree, enjoy'd by their Royal Progenitors. But I need not rely upon Conjectures, when it appears from the Testimony of our Historians, that it was the usual Custom, *i. e.* the Common Law, in the Times nearer the Conquest, for our Kings to dispose of their Crowns, as they thought fit, without regard to *Proximity of Blood*; and their Method of doing this, was by their Last Wills and Testaments. (g) Dr. Brady has by several Instances shew'd, that this is no groundless Opinion; but if I mistake not, he has omitted an Authority, by no means to be forgotten upon this Occasion: It is a Passage in *Guil. Pictaviensis*, (who had been Chaplain to the Conqueror, and is mention'd by *Guil. Gemmeticensis*, and *Ordericus Vitalis*, as a Person of undoubted Credit) in which he (h) tells us, That upon the Conqueror's Landing, *Harold* sent a Messenger to him, to inform him, that *King Edward the Confessor*, at the Time of his

(f) See his Defence, p. 9, &c.

(g) *History of Succession*. Ethelwulfus paucis ante mortem mensibus Testamentum fecit, in quo Regnum divisit inter Ethelbaldum & Ethelbrithum Filios suos. W. Malinsbur. de gest. Reg. Ang. l. 2. c. 2. p. 22. Tunc jussu Patris in Testamento, Athelstanus in Regem acclamatus est. Idem ibid. l. 2. c. 6. p. 27.

(h) *Guil. Pictaviensis*, p. 200. The Words of Harold's Messenger to the Conqueror. Hæc tibi mandat Rex Haroldus; Terram ejus ingressus es, quâ fiducia, quâ temeritate nescit. Meminit

quidem, quod Rex Edwardus te Anglici Regni Hæredem fore, pridem decreverit, & quod ipse in Normaniâ de hac Successione Securitatem tibi firmaverit. Novit autem jure suum esse Regnum idem, ejusdem Regis Domini sui dono, in extremis illius, tibi concessum. Etenim ab eo Tempore, quo B. Augustinus in hanc venit Regionem, communem gentis hujus fuisse consuetudinem, Donationem, quam in ultimo fine suo quis fecerit, eam ratam haberi. Quapropter de Terrâ jussu suâ cum Tuis te regredi postulat, &c.



Death, bequeathed his Crown to him; and therefore whatever Claim the Duke of Normandy pretended to it, it could be of no Authority; because it had been the constant Practice in England, ever since the Coming hither of S. Augustine, that Donations made at the Point of Death were always held good and valid. From whence it is evident, that this Power of the Crown was universally (i) acknowledg'd in those Days; since the Claims of both *Harold* and the *Conqueror* were founded upon it; and the Dispute between them was only, which Donation of King Edward should have the Preference, without calling in Question his Authority to make them.

I PROCEED now to the Second Query I would recommend to the Doctor's Consideration; and that is, Whether the Consent and Cession of the *Rightful* Heirs, are not sufficient to convey a Right to Princes, who before had no *Hereditary Title*? This I take to be a Point, which the Doctor will not be forward to dispute; (k) for it was never yet doubted, but Princes might part with their Rights, as well as common Subjects; and prefer a private Life, before the Burden of a Crown. And when such Resignations have been made openly, and the Subjects have had reason to believe them free, and *bona fide*, whether by direct and express Terms, or by Actions, which sufficiently implied them; the *Possessor* of the Throne, who is next in Blood, does then certainly acquire a Power and Authority, which sufficiently justifies all his Acts of Government. It is true, by the Judgment given in the House of Peers upon the Claim of *Richard Duke of York*, it was declared, That the Resignations, without Consent of *Parliament*, did not oblige the Makers of them; but this seems to have been the first Time, when this Doctrine was publicly establish'd; and therefore in all former Surrenders by the Right Heirs, it does not appear, that their Validity was ever question'd, though they were not performed in the great Council of the Kingdom.

(i) Mezeray tells us, it was the ancient Custom for the Kings of France thus to dispose of the Succession by their last Wills and Testaments. At the End of Clothaire, 2 Tit. Mœurs & Coustumes. Thus King John pretended the Donation of Richard I; and Henry IV. challenged the Realm, not only by Conquest, but also be-

cause He, by King Richard, was adopted as Heir. Holinhead's Chron. p. 511.

(k) Similis est Quæstio, an abdicari possit Regnum, aut jus succedendi in Regnum. Et quia pro se quisque abdicare possit, non est dubium. Grotius de Jure Belli & Pacis, l. 2. c. 7. sect. 26.



AND thus I have made my Way to the next Query I would propose to the Doctor; and that is, Whether it is not possible, that the general Submission and Obedience, which was paid to several of those Thirteen Kings, who are said to have had no *Hereditary Right*, might be wholly occasioned by these Motives and Principles? I am at present only concern'd for a bare Possibility of the Influence of those Reasons in the Cases in Question; because when once that is allowed, the Doctor's Constitution will still remain to be proved; and consequently we are not advanced one Step in our Discoveries of the mighty Virtue and Efficacy, which attends the Possession of a Throne; tho' we should grant him all his List of *Non-Hereditary* Kings, for which he so earnestly contends. But tho' I might content myself with referring this Matter to the Doctor's farther Consideration; and wait for better Reasons, than he has yet produced for the Support of his Assertion; I shall in the meanwhile endeavour to satisfy him, that the *Conqueror*, and some of his Successors, did not depend wholly upon their *Possession* for their Title; but had both those Pleas on their side, which I just now mentioned; viz. The Nomination of their Lawful Predecessors, and the Consent of the next Heirs; and if these were good Reasons, upon which a Claim to the Crown might be founded; they were certainly sufficient to justify the Subjects in paying them their Allegiance.

I BEGIN with *William the Conqueror*; and shall presume to affirm, That he was a Lawful King; *First*, Because King *Edward the Confessor* had appointed him his Successor, which in those Days was thought a Legal Way of disposing of the Inheritance of the Crown, as I have already shewed. For the Truth of this Assertion I have all imaginable Assurance; since it is unanimously attested by all the Writers, who flourish'd in, or near the Conqueror's Reign. (1) *Guil. Pictaviensis* tells us, That King *Edward* loved the Duke of *Normandy* as his Son, and did not only declare him his Heir, but obliged *Harold* to swear to his Succession. *Ingulfus* (who had been

(1) *Guil. Pictaviensis*, p. 191. R. Edwardus Ducem Gulielmum Heredem suum statuit, quem loco Germani aut Prolis adamabat; & ergo fidem Sacra-

mento confirmatorum Haroldum designavit, &c. Et vide p. 181, 191, 200, 205.



Secretrary (m) to the Conqueror in Normandy, and was afterwards in great Favour with him in England) informs us, (n) That King Edward being much weakened with Age, and perceiving Edgar Atheling to be unfit for the Royal Throne, as well by the Qualities of his Mind, as those of his Body, &c. appoints William Count of Normandy his Successor, and sends Robert Archbishop of Canterbury into Normandy, on purpose to acquaint him with it: And he assures us likewise, that Harold swore to maintain that Act of Settlement. The same thing is fully related by *Wilhelm. Gemmeticensis* (*Hist. Norm. l. 7. c. 31.*) who flourish'd in the Conqueror's Reign. And *Ordericus Vitalis*, an Historian of good Credit, who lived in those Times, agrees with these Writers in the Account he gives of this Matter; (*l. 2. p. 492.*) (o). I forbear multiplying Citations to this purpose; what I have already produced being abundantly sufficient to satisfy those, that are willing to be satisfy'd, that we have the concurring Testimony of many unexceptionable Authors, to prove the Conqueror's Right, by the Nomination of King Edward. Besides, this was no rash inconsiderate Act of the Confessor, nor the sole Effect of his own Will and Pleasure, without the Advice of his great Men and Counsellors; on the other hand, we find it ratified by the express (p) Assent

(m) *Ingulf. Hist. p. 73, 74. & Ord. Vitalis Hist. Eccles. l. 4. p. 542.*

(n) *Ingulf. p. 63.* Rex Edwardus Senio gravatus, cernens Clitonis Edwardi nuper defuncti filium Edgarum Regio Solio minus idoneum, tam corde quam corpore, Godwini que Comitissæ multam malamque Sobolem quotidie super terram crescere, ad Cognatum suum Wilhelmum Comitem Normanniæ animum apposuit, & eum sibi succedere in Regnum Angliæ voce stabili fancivit. ----- Hinc R. Edwardus Robertum Archiepiscopum Cant. (utpote Normannum) Legatum ad eum. à Latere suo direxit, illumque designatum sui Regni Successorem, tam debito cognationis, quam merito virtutis suæ, Archipræsulis relatu insinuavit. Ad hoc Haroldus Major domus Regiæ veniens in Normanniam, se Wilhelmo Comiti, post Regis obitum, regnum Angliæ conservaturum juravit, &c.

(o) I might have added more Testimonies out of Eadméus, the Chron. Saxonicum, Brevis Relatio de Wilhelmo primo Rege, publish'd by S. Taylour, at

the End of his Book, about Gavelkind; also from William of Malmsbury, &c. I do not mention the Fragmentum ex Libro Cadonensi de vitâ Gulielmi primi, printed by Mr. Camden in his Anglica & Normannica, because it is indeed nothing else, but a broken Transcript from Ordericus Vitalis, as will evidently appear to those, who compare it with that Historian, Lib. 7. p. 647, 656, &c. Mr. Camden (in his Epistle to Sir F. Grevill before his Anglica & Normannica) fancied it was a Piece of Guil. Piétavien-sis; but that Mistake was very excusable; Ordericus being not then printed.

(p) Edwardus igitur Optimatum suorum assensu, per Rodbertum Cantuar. Archipræsulem hujus delegationis Mediatorem, obsides potentissimæ parentelæ Godwini Comitissæ filium & nepotem ei direxit. Guil. Piétav. p. 181. & p. 200. He tells us, that the Conqueror sent this Message to Harold, That he was declared Successor by King Edward, non sine suorum Consensu, verum Consilio Stigandi Archiepiscopi, Godwini Comitissæ, Leurici Comitissæ, Sigerdi Comitissæ, qui



of his Nobility, and the People of *England*; and this was notified to the Duke of *Normandy* by the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in a particular Embassy for that purpose, as I before observed. So that it must be looked upon as a publick Act of the whole Kingdom; and had all the Authority, which the deliberate Concurrence of the People with the Desires of the Prince, could possibly give it; and a better, I presume, the Doctor will not think necessary. And whoever well considers the Citations in the Margin, and takes notice of the *Conqueror's* Appeal to the Laws of *England* for deciding the Quarrel between him and *Harold*, cannot reasonably believe, he would have put his Cause upon that Tryal, if the Constitution had not been manifestly on his side. It may indeed be objected, that King *Edward the Confessor*, having no good Title to the Crown himself, could not convey one to the Duke of *Normandy*; and this I readily allow, if by a good Title we are to understand *Proximity of Blood*; which he most certainly wanted; for the Issue of *Edmund Ironside*, Elder Brother to King *Edward*, had undoubtedly a better Claim in this respect, some of which were living in King *Edward's* Reign. But I desire it may be considered, that when the *Confessor* entred upon the Throne, the Issue of *Edmund Ironside* were in a remote Country; and that by no Fault of King *Edward*, who had been driven himself into *Normandy* by the same Violence, that forced them into *Hungary*. So that in that Juncture, when the Right Heirs were at a great Distance, their Conditions and Circumstances utterly unknown; and besides it was hardly possible to give them Notice of the Vacancy of the Throne, or receive their Answer within any reasonable Space of Time; either there must have been no Government in *England*; or else it must be confessed, King *Edward* had good Cause to take it upon him, having a Prior Title to any one else then in *England*. If it be said, He was however an *Unjust Possessor*; his Nephews by his elder Brother being living, to whom he

qui etiam jurejurando suis confirmaverant, quod post *Edwardi* decessum me reciperent Dominum, &c. And upon this Ground it was, that we find the *Conqueror* appealing (ibid.) to the English Laws for Justice against *Harold*. Præsto ego sum ad agendam causam contra *Haroldum* in judicio, siue placet illi juxta Jus Nor-

mannorum, siue potius Anglorum. Et vide W. Malsbur. L. 3. p. 56. Ingulfus says, (p. 68.) That King *Edward* appointed the Duke of *Normandy* sibi succedere in regnum Anglia stabili voce. Et Ord. Vitalis, Lib. 2. p. 492. affirms, That this was done Consuetudinibus Anglis.



ought to have resign'd the Crown; I answer: That when Histories are silent, it does not become private Men to be forward in passing Judgment on the Actions of Princes. The Authors who have transmitted to us an Account of *Edward's* Reign, say nothing upon this Subject; either that the Descendents from *Edmund Ironside* laid Claim to the Crown; or that King *Edward* discovered any Inclination to do them Justice, at least till the (q) Eleventh Year of his Reign: But it may possibly be unreasonable from thence to infer, that all that Time he was a wrongful Possessor; because Cases may be supposed of Princes, who for Want of Power and Opportunity of doing Right to the *Lawful* Heir, are forced to endure the Burden of a Crown, which they would readily and gladly ease themselves of, upon a proper Occasion. As, when the Rightful Heir is Abroad, in a distant Kingdom, and perhaps at the Disposal of a Foreign Prince, on whose Will and Pleasure his Return to his Country chiefly depends. When the Possessor of a Throne has this to plead for himself, (which may be true of King *Edward*, for any thing that can be alledg'd to the contrary) I may appeal to the severest Interpreters of the Actions of Princes, whether the Exercise of Royal Power in such Circumstances, can be charged with *Usurpation*; or as some choose rather to express themselves, whether such a Person is only a King *de Facto*. For it is not the bare Act of Seizing and Filling a Throne; but the Will of the Possessor, that must denominate him an *Usurper*. He that invades another's Right, with an Intention to detain it from him, and a Resolution never to restore it to the true Proprietor, is certainly guilty of the highest Injustice: But if he accepts of a Crown, only that he may secure it to the Right Owner, and the better disappoint the Designs of his Enemies; most certainly he obliges him by a very extraordinary Act of Friendship. In a word, by the Character transmitted to us of King *Edward*, he had neither Ambition enough to desire a Crown, nor so great a Love for State and Grandeur, as to be unwilling to part with it. When *Hardecnute* died, and the People of *England* wish'd for nothing more, than that *Edward* might be Successor; it was not without (r) some Importance, that he vouchsafed to be their King. And since

(q) Flor.  
Wigorn. p.  
416. Ed. 4<sup>o</sup>.

(r) W.  
Malmsbur.  
de Gest. Reg.  
Angl. l. 2.  
c. 13.

he



he is represented to us, as a strict Lover of Justice throughout his Reign; and his Placing *Malcolm* in the Throne of *Scotland*, in the Room of the Usurper *Macbeth*, is recorded as a considerable Instance of it; it will not become us easily to believe, he was guilty of that Crime himself, which he so severely punish'd in another. In the Eleventh Year of his Reign, as I observ'd, he sent an Ambassador purposely to the *Emperor*, that his Desire of seeing his Nephews in *England* might be intimated to them, in order to their Possession of the Crown of it; but this Embassy had no Effect till (s) three Years after, when we first hear of their Arrival; a plain Indication, that either the King of *Hungary* was unwilling to part with them, or they themselves were very little affected with the Offer of a Crown: For what other Reason can be assign'd, why they should so long deferr their Compliance with King *Edward's* kind Invitation? At length, however, we find them safely landed in *England*; and now it will perhaps be expected, that the *Confessor* should immediately make a Tender of his Kingdom. But the sudden Death of Prince *Edward* (which happen'd within a (t) few Days after his Arrival) would have prevented the Execution of such a Design, had it really been intended; and his Children were yet too young to be trusted with the Government. So that all things duly consider'd, I see no Reason for the Sentence which has been so peremptorily pass'd upon *Edward*, as an *Usurper*. I confess, the Nomination of the Duke of *Normandy* for his Successor, whereby his Nephew *Edgar* was manifestly excluded, seems to be a very plausible Objection against all I have said in his Vindication; for how could he be disposed to do his Kinsman Justice, when it is plain he disinherited him? To this I answer; *First*, That whoever duly considers the Circumstances of those Times, the Power and Ambition of *Harold*, with the Condition and Qualities of *Edgar Atheling*; will be quickly sensible, that his Uncle

(s) Ran. Higden Polychron. ad A.D. 1055. Rex Edwardus misit Aldredum Wigorn. Episcopum ad Imp. Hen. secundum, rogans eum, ut missis apud Hungariam epistolis fratuelem suum *Edwardum* filium Edmundi ferrei lateris, Angliam inde transmitteret: decreverat

enim Rex eum constituisse hæredem suum in Angliâ; sed tertio post hoc anno Angliam veniens obiit Londini.

(t) This is unanimously affirmed by all the Authors, that write concerning those Times.



did not mean him ill, in denying him a Crown, which he could easily foresee he would never be able to enjoy. When King *Edward* died, he was too (u) young to do the Office of a King; a Circumstance undoubtedly not unthought of by the *Confessor*, who had Reason to be apprehensive, that it might so happen; and then a fair Opportunity would be offer'd to the Sons of *Godwin*, of making themselves Masters of the Kingdom, which he knew they had long aspir'd after. Now it is evident, from all the Histories of this Prince, that he intended nothing more, than to disappoint the ambitious Projects of that Family, which he (x) entirely hated; and therefore took all Opportunities of humbling them. This is assign'd as a Reason, why he had never any Carnal Knowledge of his (y) Queen; (though otherwise a Lady that wanted no Charms, and is much celebrated for her exemplary Vertues) for we are told by very (z) grave Authors, that it was commonly believed, his Aversion to the Brothers begat in him that Resolution, never to have any Children by the Sister. He had not been long upon the Throne, when *Godwin and his Sons* (a) made him sufficiently sensible of their Power, by obliging him to come to a Composition with them; from whence it was evident, what was to be expected after his Decease, should a young, unactive, and irresolute Prince pretend to succeed him. This Consideration made him cast his Eyes first on (b) the Duke of *Normandy*, as the only Person capable of defeating the Designs of *Harold*; but especially after (c) the Death of his Nephew *Edward*, the Father of *Edgar Atheling*; for then it was he enter'd into a strict Alliance with Duke *William*; and made it his Business to secure to him the Crown.

(u) Ailred. Rievallensis, p. 366. says, He was a Boy at King *Edward's* Death; and mentions that as a Reason, why the English would not have him for their King. Puer tanto honore minus idoneus videbatur.

(x) Ingulfus, p. 68.

(y) She was E. *Godwin's* Daughter.

(z) Ail. Rievallensis, p. 378. Will. Malmsburiensis de Gest. Reg. Ang. L. 2. c. 13. p. 45.

(a) Chron. Saxon. ad A. D. 1048.

(b) *Edgarum Atheling* Sanctus Rex Edwardus, dum postmodum regnaret pro filio nutritiv, & hæredem Angliæ insti-

tuere cogitavit; sed filios *Godwini*, ac Gentis suæ nequitiam formidans, *Willielmum Nothum* avunculi sui filium adoptavit. Brompton. Chron. p. 908. & vide pag. 945. & Ingulf. p. 68.

(c) Rex itaque defuncto cognato (sc. *Edwardo* Principe) quia spes prioris erat soluta Suffragii, *Willielmo Comiti Normannia* Successionem Angliæ dedit. Erat ille hoc munere dignus, præstans animi Juvenis, & qui in Supremum fastigium alacri labore excreverat. Will. Malmsbur. de Gest. Reg. Ang. L. 2. cap. ult. p. 52.



## The Hereditary Right of the

BUT there was one thing farther, which contributed most to determine King *Edward* in this Choice of a Successor ; and that was, the very mean Genius, and manifest Inabilities for Government, he observ'd in his Nephew *Edgar* ; for besides his Incapacity, by Reason of his Age, he had the Misfortune to want a due Proportion of those common Endowments of Mind, which were indispensably requisite, at that Time especially, to support him upon the Throne ; through which Defects in his Understanding, he must soon have fallen a Sacrifice to those, who aimed at the Crown. This is attested by so good Authority, that it cannot reasonably be doubted of : (d) *Ingulfus* expressly assures us, that this was the chief Reason, why King *Edward* refused to name *Edgar* his Successor ; viz. *Because he perceived him to be unqualified for the Crown, as well by the Infirmities of his Mind, as those of his Body.* But (e) *William of Malmsbury* gives us his Character in plainer Terms ; By reason (says he) of his unactive, and lazy Disposition, and (to use a softer Term) his Simplicity, he became contemptible : And after having been for some while the Sport of Fortune, he is now spending the short Remainder of his decrepid Age, privately, and dishonourably in his Country-Retirement. Now I do not mention these Particulars, as if I thought his Qualities, how mean soever, could destroy his *Hereditary Right* ; but only to shew, that these were esteemed good, and sufficient Reasons, even by his Friends, who were most concern'd for his Interest, to keep him out of the Throne ; to which how just soever his Title was, his Uncle thought it would be a better Proof of his Affection to him, to leave him in the Condition of an eminent Subject, than that of a Titular King, which was the most could be expected. If I should add, that *Edgar* was sensible, it was his Interest, to decline the Possession of the Crown, and therefore complied with his Uncle's Settlement of it ; I should not want Reasons to

(d) *Ingulfus*, p. 68. R. *Edwardus* senio gravatus, cernens *Edgarum* Regio folio minus idoneum, tam corde quam corpore, *Godwinique* Comitibus multam malamque Sobolem, &c.

(e) *Will. Malmsbur.* p. 103. Pedetentim pro ignavia & (ut minus dictum sit) pro Simplicitate contemptui haberi cepit. Quantula enim Simplicitas ut

libram argenti, quam quotidie in Stipendio accipiebat, Regi pro uno equo perdonaret ? ----- Tandem *Edgarus* in Angliam rediens, diverso fortunæ ludicro rotatus, nunc remotus & tacitus canos suos in agro consumit. Et p. 93. *Edgarus*, *Athelingius* nunc penè decrepitum diem ignobilis ruri degit. *This was in King Stephen's Reign.*



countenance this Opinion; but they will more properly be taken Notice of hereafter.

HITHERTO I have endeavour'd to apologize for King *Edward's* Advancement of the Duke of *Normandy* to the Throne; taking it for granted, that the Right of Inheritance was really in his Nephew *Edgar*. But, Secondly, What if it should appear, that *Edgar* had not so good a Title, as has been generally pretended; but that King *Edward* himself was all along the true Proprietor of the Crown he enjoy'd, and might dispose of it as he pleased? I hope it will then be allowed, that no Wrong was done to *Edgar*, by calling the Duke of *Normandy* to the Succession. I desire therefore it may be considered, that the Claim of *Edgar* could only be founded on his Descent from *Edmund Ironside* his Grandfather; but *Edmund* being reduced to Extremities, does, (f) by the Advice and Approbation of his People, consent to a *Partition Treaty*, whereby the whole Kingdom was divided between him and *Cnute*; and upon *Edmund's* Death, (g) all the Nobility and Bishops of the Realm declare upon Oath, That, by Vertue of the foresaid Treaty, King *Cnute* was rightfully entitled to the Possession of the whole Kingdom of *England*; and they (h) took their Oaths to him accordingly, as to their Lawful Prince, without any Regard to the Sons of *Edmund*, whom they denied to be their Kings. I know very well, that several of our Historians are very angry with their Countrymen upon this Account; and tell us positively, they were perjur'd, by a false Attestation concerning the Terms of this Treaty: But how came they to know that? And what Authority do they produce for this Accusation?

(f) Chron. Saxon. ad A. D. 1016: Tum consilium dabant Edricus Dux & Proceres, qui ibi aderant, ut Reges inter se pacem firmarent. Reges idcirco convenerunt apud *Olenige*, & inter se amicitiam ibi confirmarunt, &c. Hen. Huntingdon. L. 6. Conveniente igitur populo, & præ gaudio lachrymante, *Edmundus* suscepit regnum *West-Sexe*, *Cnut* vero regnum *Mercia*, &c. Susceptum est hoc dictum ab utroque exercitu, & magno assensu firmatum. Will. Malmfbur. l. 2. c. 10.

(g) Post mortem *Edmundi*, Rex *Canutus* à Proceribus & Episcopis suis: quaesivit, si in ullo fœdere Sociali inter ipsum & *Edmundum* Regem nuper inito, aliqua

mentio de Successione fratrum aut filiorum *Edmundi*, post mortem ejusdem, facta fuisset; qui responderunt quodd non, &c. Brompton. Chron. & Ran. Higden.

(h) At illi (sc. omnes Episcopi, & Duces, nec non & Principes, cunctique Optimates Gentis Angliæ, Londoniæ congregati) juraverunt *Canuto Regi*, quodd cum Regem sibi eligere vellent, eique libenter obedire; & suo Exercitui vestigalia dare, & accepto pignore de manu suâ nudâ cum juramentis à Principibus *Danorum* fratres & filios *Edmundi* omninò despexerunt, eosque Reges esse negaverunt. Sim. Dunelm. ad A. C. 1016. Flor. Wigorn.



Truly none at all: But they expect their bare Word should be taken; and we are to believe all the Great Men of the Kingdom were Persons of neither Conscience nor Honour; because it is the Will and Pleasure of these Authors it should be so. I shall beg Leave therefore to look upon that Publick and National Testimony, relating to the Agreement between King *Edmund* and *Cnute*, to be a good Proof of the Right and Title of the latter, till some Evidence appears to the contrary; and from the whole Matter I inferr, That King *Edmund* having made an absolute *Surrender and Dedition* of his Kingdom, after his Decease, to King *Cnute*; his Sons, and their Issue were thereby entirely deprived of their Right of Succession; and consequently *Edgar Atheling* had no just Pretensions to the Crown of *England*. But it will be demanded, How could the *Confessor* derive a Title from King *Cnute*? I answer; The *Confessor* being Half-Brother to King *Hardecnute*, (the Son of *Cnute*) and much in his Favour, was (i) appointed by him his *Heir and Successor*; by which Donation having acquired the Crown, he had it entirely in his Power to dispose of it as he pleas'd; and was under no Legal Obligation to give it to his Nephew *Edgar*, rather than to the Duke of *Normandy*. Having thus vindicated the *Confessor's* Grant of his Kingdom to the said Duke; I shall now proceed farther in my Undertaking to clear his Title.

It may possibly be objected against it, that King *Edward*, when he lay a dying, named *Harold* for his Successor; whereby his former Grant to the Duke of *Normandy* was revoked, according to the Law of *England* (k) before mentioned, which held all *Donations* for Good and Valid, which were made at the Hour of Death; and we are told, That *Harold* challenged the Crown by Vertue of such a pretended Nomination. But the Authority of *William of Malmsbury* (who lived near those Times) is sufficient to render it suspected: (l) He

(i) Encomium Emmæ. p. 177. *Hardecnuto* fraterno correptus amore, nuncios mittit ad *Edwardum*, rogans ut veniens secum obtineret regnum; qui fratri adveniens *Anglicas* partes advehitur --- hic fides habetur Regni Sociis, &c. Guil. Gemmeticensis Hist. Norm. l. 7. *Hardecnutus* paululum confirmatus in culmine regni, fratrem suum *Edwardum* à *Normannia* revocavit, ac secum cohabitare fecit. Ipse autem non plenis duo-

bus annis existens, exivit hominem, & *Edwardum* totius Regni reliquit heredem.

(k) P. 23.

(l) Will. Malmsbur. de Gest. Reg. Ang. l. 2. cap. ult. Post mortem *Edwardi*, *Haroldus* arripuit Diadema *Angliæ*, quamvis *Angli* dicant à Rege concessum: quod tamen magis benevolentiam quam judicio allegari existimo, ut illi hæreditatem transfunderet suam, cujus semper suspectam habuerat potestatem.



confesses indeed, that it was reported by the English, that King Edward did appoint Harold his Successor; but he tells us likewise, That he did not think it probable, that Edward should transferr the Right of Inheritance on a Person, whose Power he always apprehended, and was jealous of. This shews, that there was no good Evidence in those Days, of the Fact in Question; for if there had, it would have been impossible for *Malmsbury* to be ignorant of it. If any thing of that Nature had really happen'd; it ought to have been well attested, and publickly proclaim'd throughout the Kingdom, that there might have been no Room for a Doubt concerning it. The Donation to the Duke of Normandy was made with Solemnity; it was notified to him by no less a Person, than the Archbishop of *Canterbury*; it was ratified by the Consent and Approbation of the Nobility, and People of *England*; and lastly, his Right of Succession was sworn to by *Harold*, and others the most eminent Persons of the Kingdom; so that we have not one Historian, who flourish'd in or near those Times, but takes Notice of it; neither was there a Man in *England*, who could plead Ignorance of so publick a Transaction. What Reason, can we imagine, there should be, for *Edward* to revoke his first Donation, and appoint *Harold* his Successor, instead of the Duke of Normandy? Was *Harold* more nearly related to him? The Contrary is well known. Had the Duke of Normandy ever offended *Edward*? Nothing of this Nature appears in History. Was it more for the Interest, and Peace of the Kingdom? That would be a strange Assertion, if we consider *Harold's* Oath to the Duke of Normandy, by Vertue of which that Duke had a just Cause of War against him, if he should presume to take Possession of the Throne. In a word, the stronger the Motives were to alter the Succession, the more reasonable it was to establish such an Alteration by the best Authorities, and in the publickest Manner; whereas on the contrary, we have all imaginable Assurance of the Settlement made on the Conqueror; but very slender Proofs of *Harold's* Title.

To conclude; If after all I have hitherto urged in relation to *Edgar Atheling*, his Claim should be still thought good, and uncontestable; I beg Leave to observe farther, that after the Death of the Confessor, he either for-



bore to challenge the Crown as his Right; or else made an absolute Surrender of it. When *Harold* took Possession of the Throne, we meet not with the least Intimation in our Chronicles, that he thought himself injur'd; nor was there an *English* Man, that we hear of, that resented his Exclusion. Can we then imagine, that his Title was at that time look'd upon as unquestionable? Or must we believe the whole Nation unanimously concurr'd in depriving him of his Right? If they did, then the Injury was done him by his own People, not by the *Conqueror*; for he only dispossess'd *Harold*, who had no Right; and it could not be expected from him, he should place a Person in the Throne, whom they had before rejected. It is true indeed, after the Battle of *Hastings*, when the *Saxon* Nobility were sensible, that their Liberties and Fortunes were in imminent Danger, and some bold and daring Attempt was necessary; they (m) declared *Edgar* their King; and placed him at their Head, in order to make a Stand against the *Conqueror*; but this was a desperate and vain Effort, as the Event soon shew'd; and then (n) *Edgar*, with his Adherents, submit themselves to King *William*, and swear Fealty to him. In a little time after, it must be confess'd, *Edgar* (o) revolted, and joining with the *Scots*, laid Siege to *York*; but the *Conqueror's* Appearance obliged him immediately to retire; and then he found it necessary, by a fresh (p) Submission, to sue to him again for Favour; which he very generously granted him, and gave him many noble Testimonies (q) of it. From that Moment we hear no more of him, during the *Conqueror's* Reign; but that he was well-contented with the Honours and Riches heap'd upon him, and never would be persuaded to struggle more for a Crown; which, in the Opinion of all wise Men, it was no more for his Interest, than it was in

(m) Guil. Pictav. p. 204. Et Guil. Gemmet. p. 290.

(n) Order. Vitalis, p. 503. *Edgarus Adelinus* resistere diffidens humiliter Gulielmo se regnumque contulit.

(o p q) Guil. Malmsburiensis. *Edgarus Athelingius* cum Stigando & Aldredo Archiepiscopis Regis dedititius, sequenti anno, facto ad Scotum transfugio, *jusjurandum maculavit*. ----- Redit vero brevi *Edgarus* & impetravit veniam, & magno Donativo donatus

est, & plurimis annis in Curia mansit. Guil. Pictav. p. 208. *Adelinum*, quem post *Haroldi* ruinam Angli Regem statuere conati fuerant, amplis terris ditavit, atque in charissimis habuit eum, quia Regis *Edwardi* genus contigerat. Order. Vitalis, p. 503. Rex vero *Gulielmus*, quia idem Puer (*Edgarus* scil.) mitis & sincerus erat, & Confobrinus *Edwardi* Magni Regis, amicabiliter eum amplexatus est, & omni vita sua inter filios suos honorabiliter veneratus est.



his Power to obtain. It is evident, therefore, from good Authorities, that *Edgar* made a full and absolute Resignation of his Claim to the *Conqueror*, by Vertue of which (had King *Edward's* Settlement been of no Authority) he now became a King *de Jure*, and had a Right to the Obedience of the People of *England*; and therefore, with the Doctor's Pardon, I shall reckon him among those Kings, who had a good Title, independent on their Possession.

I SHALL now try, if I can do as much Service to his Son *William Rufus*; and that can be no difficult Undertaking, if the Kings of *England* had a Power of naming their Successors; which, by the Authorities I have produced, seems very reasonable to believe. That the *Conqueror* declared *Rufus* his Successor to the Crown of *England*, can never be controverted by those, who are acquainted with our Histories; which agree in nothing more, than in this Particular Fact. It is true, *Robert* Duke of *Normandy*, being eldest Son to King *William*, pretended *England* belong'd to him by Right of Inheritance; and therefore, with the Assistance of some of the great *Norman* Lords settled here, gave *Rufus* some Disturbance for two or three Years. But it seems, the *English* (who had the Confidence, in those Days, (r) to value themselves upon their Fidelity to their Princes) (s) thought *Rufus's* the better Title; and therefore firmly adhered to him; and defended him so well, that *Robert* found it advisable to come to an Agreement with his Brother, (t) by which the Kingdom was entirely yielded up to *Rufus*. We are told indeed, that (u) *Rufus* violating the Articles of this Treaty, the two Brothers were soon after engaged in a fresh War; but those Differences were in a very little time amicably composed, by the (x) Mediation of *Philip* King of *France*; of which the (y) *French* Historians have given an ample Account; and we do not find, that Duke *Robert* gave

(r) Ord. Vitalis, p. 666. The English speak to *Rufus*: Solertèr Anglorum rimare historias, inueniesque semper fidos Principibus suis Angligenas.

(s) Ord. Vitalis, p. 666, 667.

(t) A. D. 1091. Ord. Vitalis, p. 693. Flor. Wigorn. ad A. D. 1091.

(u) Flor. Wigorn. ibid.

(x) Guil. Gemmet. p. 293.

(y) Præfat. D. Gale ad Hist. Brit.

Scriptores. Cur Guilielmo primo Gul. *Rufus* in Regno successerit, posthabito seniore fratre *Roberto*, aut nullam aut futilem rationem adferunt nostri homines. Habuit certè ea res nobilem controversiam, cujus Gallorum Rex arbitrer, delectus, solenne pro tribunali Decretum protulit, & Fratres ad Concordiam reduxit.



*The Hereditary Right of the*

his Brother any farther Trouble, during his Reign. On the contrary, (z) about five or six Years before *Rufus's* Death, *Robert* mortgages his *Duchy of Normandy* to him for 10000 Marks, and leaves him in Possession of it, during his Expedition to the *Holy Land*; and it is well known, King *Rufus* held it as long, as he did the Kingdom of *England*: So that if the *Conqueror's* Authority to dispose of his Crown should be disputed; his Son *Rufus* was however a Rightful King, for the greater Part of his Reign, by the Consent and Agreement of his Brother. As for *Edgar Atheling*, it is evident, upon the strictest Enquiry, that he never laid Claim to the Crown after the *Conqueror's* Decease; neither had he any Friends to prompt him to it. The *English*, I have observ'd, were unanimous for *Rufus*, on whom alone *Edgar* had Reason to depend; and if we search the Records of those Times, we shall meet with manifest Signs and Indications of his entire Submission to *Rufus*, as to his own particular Concerns. (a) In the last Year of the *Conqueror*, it appears, that *Edgar* obtain'd that Prince's Consent to go into *Apulia* with Two Hundred Men; and we are assured he set Sail from *England* upon that Expedition. In the Year 1089, we find him in *Normandy*; and then it is (b) said, he was one of Duke *Robert's* chief Counsellors. Now it must be observed, that Duke *Robert* did at that time challenge the Crown of *England* himself; and therefore we may be confident, *Edgar*, who entirely depended upon him, and thought himself happy in that Prince's Friendship, would not disoblige him by setting up an opposite Claim of his own. 'Tis rather probable, that *Edgar* would have been glad to have seen *Robert* on the Throne, (c) for whom he had a most passionate Concern and Affection: But however that might have been; we are sure, that afterwards, upon the Reconciliation of the two Brothers, *Edgar* also made his Peace with *Rufus*; which, we may be positive, could not be effected, without the Recognition of his Title, and a Tender of his Service and Obedience: For a Proof of

(z) Flor. Wigorn. ad A. D. 1069. Guil. Gemmet. p. 296. Ord. Vitalis, p. 723. Eadmer. Hist. Nov. l. 2. p. 35.

(a) Flor. Wigorn. ad A. D. 1086. Et Sim. Dunelm. p. 213.

(b) Ord. Vitalis, p. 681. l. 8. Edgar Adelinus unus ex præcipuis Ducis Normanniæ Consiliariis.

(c) Ord. Vitalis, l. 10. p. 778. Ducem Robertum sibi cœvum quasi Collataneum fratrem diligebat.

which,



which, he undertakes to mediate (*d*) a Treaty between *Scotland* and *Rufus*, which terminated in a happy Peace between them. A few Years after, we are inform'd, that (*e*) *Rufus* took Care to shew, in what a Degree of Favour and Credit *Edgar* was with him, by placing him at the Head of an Army, that he might settle his Nephew on the Throne of *Scotland*. Now these mutual Kindnesses, that pass'd between *Edgar* and the Two Brothers, are evident Tokens, that he had abandon'd all Thoughts of a Crown, and desired only to enjoy their Friendship, in the humble Condition of a Subject.

THE Successor to *Rufus* was his Brother *Henry*, whose Title must be the next Subject of Examination. And what is there, that can fairly be objected against it, if the *Conqueror's Testamentary Power* is admitted? Was not *Robert*, the eldest Son, legally excluded by it? And did not that *Exclusion* justify *Henry's* Claim after *Rufus*? Or must we suppose the *Conqueror* (who (*f*) had been highly provoked by *Robert's* frequent Rebellions, by which his Life was often endanger'd; and who, besides, (*g*) plainly discern'd in his Son an utter Incapacity for Government) intended only a short Suspension of his Title, which was to revive again upon *Rufus's* Decease? Upon the Death of this Prince, *Henry* loses no Time; but, with the (*h*) Approbation of the Nobility, immediately steps into the Throne, and was universally obey'd by all the (*i*) *English*, as their Lawful King. But when *Robert* return'd from the *Holy Land*, which happen'd very soon after, he presently renew'd his Claim; and was assisted in his Attempts to recover it, by several *Norman* Lords then residing in *England*. Now the Question is, Which Party was in the Right; the *English* who adhered to King *Henry*, or the *Normans* who endeavoured to depose

(*d*) A. D. 1091. Vide Flor. Wigorn. & Ord. Vital. p. 701.

(*e*) Sim. Dunelm. ad A. D. 1097. Buchanan. Rer. Scot. l. 7. fol. 75. & Flor. Wigorn.

(*f*) Will. Malmsb. de Wilhel. primo, l. 3. p. 59. & p. 62. Robertus Philippum Regem Francorum contra Patrem excitavit; quare & Genitoris benedictione & hereditate frustratus, Angliam post mortem ejus caruit, Comitatu Normanniæ vix retento. Et p. 86. l. 4. de Henrico primo.

(*g*) W. Malmsb. in fine Lib. 4. de Rege Hen. primo: Robertus pro molitie animi nunquam regendæ Reipublicæ idoneus judicatus. Et vide W. Gemmet. p. 298. Ord. Vital. p. 572, 573, 659, 815.

(*h*) Chron. Saxon. ad A. D. 1100. Optimates qui prop. fuerunt, ejus fratrem Heanrigum in Regem elegerunt.

(*i*) Rog. Hoveden. in Hen. primo: Episcopi, milites gregarii, & Angli animo constanti cum Henrico persistere. Et Ord. Vitalis, l. 10. p. 786.



him? If the former; then *Henry* was a *King de Jure* in their Opinion; If the latter; then it was Lawful to take up Arms against a *King in Possession*, for the Right Heir out of *Possession*; which is manifestly against the Doctor's whole Design and Purpose. Possibly it will be said, the *English* obey'd *King Henry*, because he was in *Possession*; and could not be justified upon any other Principle. But how do we know this? Is there any Evidence yet produced; or does any thing appear in our Histories, sufficient to support such an Assertion? This is the Point in Dispute, which must be proved, before the Doctor can reasonably expect his Adversaries should be convinced; and how he will be able to do that, becomes him to consider. Lastly, when the Doctor has done his worst, he can only prove *King Henry* to have been an *Usurper* the first Year of his Reign; for in the second, *Duke Robert* came to a Composition with his Brother, by which he absolutely yielded up the Crown of *England* to him. (k) *Ordericus Vitalis* assures us, that when both Armies were in Sight of one another, and every Moment an Engagement expected, *Henry* sends to his Brother *Robert*, to demand the Reason of his invading him. *Robert* answers, That he *had enter'd his Father's Kingdom as due to him by Birthright*. *Henry* then proposes a Conference, which was agreed to, and held before both Armies; the Issue of which was, *That both the Brothers very affectionately embraced and kissed each other, and immediately became Friends*; *Robert* renouncing all Pretensions to *England* for the future; and *Henry* obliging himself to pay him 3000 l. per Annum, and restore to him some Lands in *Normandy*. Thus was *Henry* confirm'd in his Throne, and reign'd very prosperously the Remainder of his Days, without any Rebellion or Disturbance. A few Years after, it is true, *Robert*, by (l) breaking the Treaty he had made with his Brother, and his Oppressive and Tyrannical Government, provoked *Henry* to invade *Normandy*; and the Event was, that *Robert* was taken Prisoner, and sent into *England*; where he (m) remained under Confinement in

(k) Ord. Vitalis, l. 10. p. 788. ad A. D. 1101. & Chron. Saxon.

(l) Ord. Vitalis, p. 814, 815.

(m) Ord. Vitalis, p. 823, 866. The Saxon Chronicle represents this Matter otherwise; for there we find, that D. Ro-

bert being taken Prisoner in the Year 1106, continued for 20 Years in the Custody of Roger Bishop of Salisbury, and then, by the Advice of the Empress Maud, and David King of Scots, was committed to the Care of Robert Earl of Gloucester, in



the Castle of *Bristol* to the Time of his Death, which was the Space of Twenty Seven Years.

UPON this Occasion I hope I shall be pardon'd, if I step a little out of my way, to wipe off an Asperſion caſt upon this Prince in our common Hiſtories, upon the account of the Uſage of his Brother ; as if it were beyond Example barbarous and inexcusable.

I HAVE ſaid, that King *Henry* found it neceſſary to invade *Normandy*, upon the repeated Complaints and Importunities of the Inhabitants of that Duchy, who represented their Miſeries as inſupportable under his Brother's Government. For when the (*n*) *Pope* deſired King *Henry* to reſeal Duke *Robert* out of Priſon, and reſtore *Normandy* to him as his Right ; the King answers, That what he had done, was at the preſſing Inſtances of the Biſhops, the Clergy, and the chief Nobility of *Normandy*; the inſufferable Oppreſſions of his Brother tending to the manifeſt Ruin of their Country ; and therefore they intreated him to reſcue it from the Tyranny of a Perſon, who was by no means fit to govern. This was the true Motive of that Expedition againſt *Robert* ; and this was the Reaſon, why he would not truſt him again with the Government of *Normandy*; but ſent him into *England*, there to be kept under a Gentle Confinement. I call it a Gentle Confinement ; becauſe I think I have good Warrant ſo to do ; notwithstanding many celebrated Writers, and ſome of them of good Antiquity, have related a tragical Story of the Hardſhips he endured in his Imprisonment, and that at laſt he was deprived of his Eyeſight by the barbarous Commands of his Brother. The firſt Author I have met with, who thought this Story worthy of Credit, is *Matthew Paris*, who gives a particular (*o*) Relation of it. But againſt his Authority it

*Bristol* Caſtle. Chron. Saxon. ad A. D. 1126. This is alſo confirm'd by *Matthew Paris's* Chronicon, (a MS. written with his own Hand, now in the Cotton Library. Claudius, D. 6.) in which are the following Words : Rex autem victor in Angliam rediens, fratrem ſuum Robertum miſit ad Caſtrum de Deviſes deputatum Cuſtodie XII. virorum fortium, perpetuo carceri mancipandum. The Caſtle of the Deviſes belong'd to the ſaid Roger Biſhop of Sarum.

(*n*) Ord. Vitalis, l. 12. p. 865, 866.

(*o*) *Math. Paris*, (p. 63. ad A. D. 1107.) Rex Archiepiſcopum ſecutus in

Angliam, Robertum fratrem ſuum, & Willelmum Moretonii Conſulem perpetuo carceri mancipavit. Eodem tempore Dux Robertus immemor illius boni conſilii, (humiliamini ſub potenti manu) in ampulloſa verba & minas prorupit, falſis pollicitis, & præcipue Comitibus Ceſtreſis animatus ; deceptis igitur cuſtodibus conatus eſt evadere : ſed fugiens ab eodem captus eſt, incidens ſuo manno in bitumen profundum ; fuerat autem reverenter in liberâ cuſtodia detentus. Quod cum Regi nunciaretur, juſſit eum arctiori carceri & cuſtodie mancipatum, fulgenti obſtaculo oculorum luce privari.

may



may justly be objected, *First*, That he wrote his History above a Hundred Years after the Fact in Question. *Secondly*, This Piece of History is not found in *Roger Wendover*, (as (p) Dr. *Watts* has observ'd) which is sufficient to render it suspected; for those who are proper Judges in these Affairs, tell us, (q) that *Matthew Paris* is but the *Continuator* of *Roger Wendover*, and intended only to carry on the Series of History, where the other left off. It is true, in that Edition of *Wendover*, which *Paris* has given us, we meet here and there with some Insertions, not warranted by the genuine Copy of *Wendover* in the *Cotton Library*, yet supposed to be added by *Matthew Paris* himself; but it has been observed by learned Men, that (r) those Interpolations are generally Pieces of secret History, and unworthy of any Credit.

*Matthew of Westminster* is the next Writer, that has occur'd to me, in whom this Story is to be found; and he seems to relate it more fully, than *Matthew Paris*. His Account is this; (p. 27.) That Duke Robert having attempted to make his Escape out of Prison, had his Eyes put out in such a Manner, that the Balls of them were still preserv'd entire; and thus he ended his Days very miserably. But *Henry Knighton* (who wrote at the latter End of *Richard II.*'s Reign) has thought fit to add these farther Circumstances; That Duke Robert being condemn'd to die by the Barons of England, his Brother did him the Favour to cause his Eyes to be put out, by some (s) burning Instrument

(p) Dr. *Watts*, in Variant. Lect. ad *Matth. Paris*. p. 63.

(q) *Selden's Mare Clausum*. Ed. Eng. Fol. l. 2. c. 15. p. 296. *The Chronicles set forth by Matthew Paris were wholly taken out of Roger of Wendover, until the 19th Year of Henry III.*

(r) It may not be amiss to give the Reader a Specimen of some of these Interpolations, that he may be the better enabled to judge of the rest. P. 58. *M. Paris* tells us, That *Maud*, who was married to *Henry I.* had been educated in a Monastery, where she had vowed Virginity, and was reported to have taken upon her the Veil; for which Reason she was married against her Will; and therefore she solemnly cursed her Issue, if ever she should have any, and commended them to the Devil. Now this Passage is wanting in *Wendover*; and we know it to be false from the Authority of *Eadmerus*, who confutes it at large.

P. 73. *The Story of Robert Duke of Normandy's Death is not to be found in Wendover, and well deserves to be looked on as fabulous.*

P. 243. We have an incredible Story of King *John's* sending a private Message to the King of *Morocco*, to offer him his Kingdom, and assure him he would renounce the Christian Faith, and embrace the *Mahometan* Religion. A Piece of History to be found in no Author but *M. Paris*; *Wendover* knew nothing of it, neither is it mentioned by *Matt. of Westminster*, (the Transcriber of *M. Paris*) nor even by *M. Paris* himself in his *Historia minor*; for which Reasons, as well as others, Dr. *Watts* thought he had reason to reject it. Vide D. *Watts* *Adversaria* ad *Matth. Paris*, ad p. 243.

These Instances may serve to shew, what Liberty *M. Paris* took in his Insertions, and how little they are to be trusted.

(s) *Excæcari cum batillo ardenti.*

applied



applied to them. [H. Knighton, de Event. Angliæ, l. 2. c. 8.] Now so remarkable a Punishment inflicted on so eminent a Person, as *Robert Duke of Normandy*, the King's elder Brother, could not surely be a Secret to all the Writers, who flourished at that Time; and had it been known to them, undoubtedly they would not have failed to give us some Account of it. But to our great Surprise, instead of allowing any Countenance to this Story, they relate the quite contrary. (t) *Will. Gemeticensis* says, Robert was a Prisoner at large to the End of his Life. (u) *Ordericus Vitalis* affirms, That he was supplied abundantly, during the Twenty Seven Years of his Imprisonment, with all manner of Delicacies. *William of Malmshbury's* Account is still more circumstantial; for he (x) assures us, That Duke Robert being taken by King Henry, was kept by him as a Prisoner at large to the Day of his Death; and this, he says, was a laudable Instance of Henry's Brotherly Affection; in that he inflicted no other Punishment on Duke Robert, besides Solitude; if that may be call'd a solitary State, in which he was always attended with Company; and besides, was frequently entertained with Feasts, and other Diversions. I am persuaded, these Passages are very clear and plain; and upon their Authority I shall presume to say, that those Tragical Relations of Duke Robert's being deprived of his Sight, by King Henry's Order, are by no means to be credited.

I NOW flatter myself, I have said all that is necessary, in Vindication of *Henry I.'s* Title; for I know not how to imagine, that *Edgar Atheling* should be any more objected. He had before yielded up the quiet Possession of the Crown to Three Kings; and therefore it is not likely, he should have any Stomach to it in this Reign. The Truth is, he had for some time liv'd with so much Privacy and Obscurity, that we (y) hardly meet with his Name in the Histories of *Henry I.'s* Govern-

(t) P. 298.

(u) *Ordericus Vitalis*, l. 11. p. 823: Rex Henricus 27 annis fratrem Robertum in carcere servavit; & omnibus delictis abundanter pavit.

(x) *Will. Malmshur. de Gest Angl.* l. 4. de Hen. primo, in fine. Robertus D. Normanniæ à fratre Henrico captus, ad diem mortis in liberâ tentus custodia; laudabili fratris pietate, quod nihil præter solitudinem passus sit mali, si

solitudo dici possit, ubi & Custodum diligentia, & jocorum præterea, & obsequiorum non deerat frequentia.

(y) *The Saxon Chronicle* (ad A. D. 1106.) says, Edgar was taken Prisoner with Duke Robert at the Battle of *Tenchebrai*. Et *Annal. Waverl.* ad A. D. 1106. And this, I believe, is the only Account we meet of him in *Henry the First's* Reign.



ment; and had not *Malmsbury* told us, he was in Being when he wrote; we might well have believ'd; he had long before resign'd his Breath, as well as his Title.

KING *Stephen's* Reign follows in Order; in which surely, if any where, we may expect to find some plain and legible Characters of the Existence and Operation of the Doctor's Principle: For *Stephen* was indeed a King *de Facto*, without any Title, but what he derived from Possession. The Kings, that were before him, had either the *Will* of their Predecessors, or the Cession of the *Right Heirs*, to render their Reigns Lawful; but *Stephen* was an *errant Usurper*. He (z) had sworn to the Succession of *Maud* the Empress; and he knew that (a) all the Nobility and Prelates had done the same; and therefore as he had obtained the Crown by *Perjury*, he could not otherwise keep it, than by Arms and Violence. It is (b) reported indeed, that King *Henry*, when he lay a dying, disinherited his Daughter *Maud*, and declared *Stephen* his Successor; and by this Artifice, it is said, the *Archbishop* was prevail'd with to crown him; but the (c) Doctor has thought fit to reject this Story, as incredible; and (d) I am very willing to agree with him in that Point; provided it may be allowed to be a farther Confirmation of the ancient Custom of the *Kings of England*, to name their Successors; for otherwise that Report must have been useless and insignificant; and could not possibly have served the Purpose, for which it was intended. Thus far therefore I have the good Fortune to be of the Doctor's Opinion; but that Happiness is not like to continue long; for I must now take the Liberty to tell him, that King *Stephen's* being an *Usurper*, will be of no manner of Advantage to his Cause, that I can by any means perceive. He was advanced to the

(z) *W. Malmsbur. Hist. Novell. l. 1. p. 100.*

(a) *W. Malmsbur. ibid. Roger. Hoveden, p. 481. Gervaf. Dorob. J. Brompton, &c.*

(b) *Rad. de Diceto Abbrev. Chron. p. 505. Et Gesta R. Stephani, p. 929.*

(c) *Defence, p. 18.*

(d) *W. Malmsbur. Nov. Hist. l. 1. says expressly, That King Henry I. when he lay a dying, interrogatus à Roberto Comite Glocestriæ de Successore, Rex*

*filiz omnem Terram suam citra & ultra mare legitimâ & perenni successione adjudicavit. Et Hist. Nov. l. 2. He says, Henry Bishop of Winchester (King Stephen's Brother) own'd publicly in a full Synod, quod Rex Henricus nonnullis ante obitum annis filiz suæ quondam Imperatrici omne regnum Angliæ, simul & Ducatum Normanniæ, jurari ab omnibus Episcopis simulque Baronibus fecerit, si successore masculino ex illâ, quam Lotharingâ duxerat, uxore careret.*



Throne by the (e) Bishops; and confirm'd in it by the Pope: And some of the Writers of those Times (f) speak of it with Admiration, *that in an Instant all England became subject unto him.* But we must distinguish between those, that advanced him to the Throne, and those that only obeyed him, and swore to him, when he was in it. The first Sort are exclaim'd against by the forementioned Historians, (in the Places cited) as unrighteous and perjured Men; and they observe to us, that therefore the Archbishop of Canterbury, by the just Judgment of GOD, did not live a Year after; and the Bishop of Salisbury, by the same Hand of Providence, ended his Days very miserably. And the Doctor himself is so far from justifying such Actions, that he will freely give us Leave to account it a Crime, to set up a King *de Facto*; though he contends for Obedience to him, when he is already made. The Question therefore is, concerning those alone, who submitted to his Government, and acknowledged him for their King, after he was placed in the Throne; these, the Doctor is of Opinion, cannot be defended by any honest Principle, besides this, *That Allegiance is due to a King in Possession.* But if this was really the Case, why have not our Historians done us the Favour to let us know it? Why was so useful an Expedient, upon such Occasions, and Exigencies, conceal'd from Posterity? Or is there any Hint to be found in the Writers of those Times, that may help us to the Discovery of so valuable a Secret? Unkind and Ill-natur'd Historians! You that pretended to write for the Benefit of future Ages, how could you suffer us to be ignorant of a Doctrine, that had done you so much Service, and without which we can never be truly sensible of the Blessing of a Revolution? In a word, they have been pleas'd to publish some of the Reasons, by which the great Men endeavour'd to justify their Submission to Stephen; which must increase our Wonder very much, that the Doctor's Notion should find no Place among them, had it really been known and made use of. (g) Some affirm'd, that their Oath to *Maud* was forced upon them by King Henry; for which he express'd his Sorrow on his Death-Bed, and releas'd them from it. The great Bishop of Salisbury (h) excused himself in another Manner; for he pretended, that he swore to *Maud's*

(e) *The Bishops tell K. Stephen, that he was Ecclesie sinu exceptus, non manu militum in regnum promotus.* W. Malmshur. Hist. Nov. l. 2.

(f) Roger Hoveden, p. 481. Et J. Brompton, p. 1023.

(g) *Gesta R. Stephani.* p. 929.

(h) W. Malmshur. Hist. Nov. l. 1.

Suc-



Succession conditionally, viz. *Provided that the King did not marry her out of the Kingdom, without the Consent of the Peers.* Others (i) alledged, it was unnatural, and against the Laws of the Realm, for a Woman to reign: And lastly, it was (k) urged, that Oaths were not to be kept to the Hazard of Peoples Lives and Fortunes; for *Man was not made for Oaths; but Oaths were instituted for the Use of Men; and therefore no Man ought to be a Slave to his Oath; but his Oath ought to be subservient to his Interest and Safety.*

THESE (l) Reasons, such as they are, may be found in the Writings of those Times; particularly in the *Causa Regis Stephani*, an ancient Manuscript in the Cotton Library, drawn up purposely in Defence of that Prince against *Maud* the Empress; and therefore it is not to be conceiv'd, so useful a Principle, so essential, as the Doctor thinks it to the Constitution, should have been forgotten upon that Occasion, had its Influence and Authority been so well understood, as he imagines: On the contrary, if we take an impartial View of this Reign, we shall meet with many Arguments to convince us, it was a Doctrine never thought of in those Times. That I may fully satisfy the Reader in this Point, I shall desire Leave to observe to him, *First*, That there never was a more unquiet and tumultuous Reign, than *Stephen's* was, upon the sole Account of his being an *Usurper*. And, *Secondly*, That they who adhered to him, did not believe it to be their Duty so to do, purely because he was in Possession. *First*, I say there never was a more unquiet and tumultuous Reign, than this of *Ste-*

(i) Matth. Paris. p. 74. Omnes, tam Præfules quam Comites, qui Filia Regis, & suis hæredibus juraverant Fidelitatem, consensum Stephano præbuerunt: dicentes, fore nimis turpe, si tot Nobiles Famina subderentur. Et, *Causa Regis Stephani*. MS. in Bibl. Cotton. Galba, A. 3. 2. Muliebris superbix est & temeritatis, ad id quod non est sui juris vel ordinis, aspirare, quam Natura, Sexus infirmitas dehortantur regni laboriosa moderamina appetere. Legibus viros coercere onus grave est, quod viriles humeri vix sufficiunt portare. Quid indecentius, quid inhonestius, quam viros à muliere imbecillâ gubernari, & à suo Rege destitui?

(k) *Causa Regis Stephani* in Bibl. Cotton. ibid. Et tamen quamvis jura-

mentum summopere sit observandum, non usquequaque immobiliter est tenendum, ut nullâ ex causâ solvi debeat, cum & Divinæ Legis instituta quædam, pro tempore, urgente necessitate, transgredi liceat. Non homo propter juramentum, sed juramentum propter hominem est institutum. Et ided non homo juramento, sed juramentum homini, & ejus saluti subservire debeat.

(l) *The Bishop of Winchester gave another Reason, why Stephen his Brother was receiv'd as King.* Quia longum videbatur Dominam expectare, quæ moras ad veniendum in Angliam necessebat, (in Normanniâ quippe residebat) provisum est Paci Patriæ, & regnare permisus Frater meus. W. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. l. 2.



phen ; which must be confessed by all, who have perused the ancient Writers of History ; and whoever doubts of it, will be easily convinc'd, by the (m) Places cited in the Margin ; where the Miseries the Kingdom endured by those Civil Wars, for near the Space of Fifteen Years, are very fully represented. In the (n) Second and Third Years of his Reign, the Commotions first began ; and then Robert Earl of Gloucester declared for Maud against him ; and at the same time many (o) Prelates, and Persons of the greatest Quality, in several Parts of the Kingdom, take up Arms for the Empress. In the midst of these Confusions at Home, (p) Normandy provides itself with a new Master Abroad ; and David King of Scotland takes care to invade the Borders in her Quarrel. The Year (q) following, Maud the Empress lands in England, and was immediately assisted by the Welsh, under the Earls of Hereford and Chester ; by whose Fidelity and Conduct she was soon in Condition to give Battle to Stephen, in (r) which she took him Prisoner. It is true, by a Reverse of Affairs, he recover'd his Liberty before the Year expired ; and fancied himself powerful enough to reduce the Kingdom entirely to his Obedience. But that Piece of good Fortune added only Length, not any Quiet to his Reign ; for his Enemies continued still in Circumstances to disturb his Government ; and never laid down their Arms, till they had obliged him to agree to a Composition with Henry II. which did not happen, till the last Year of his Reign. Is it not then reasonable to expostulate with the Doctor, why he should imagine, this Prince's Case could be serviceable to his Design ? He was to prove the Right and Authority of Kings *de Facto*, from the Acquiescence and Submission of the Subjects ; but Stephen was never permitted to enjoy any Peace and Quietness, that deserves to be taken Notice of ; because a great Part of *England* would not endure him for their King. Surely an Instance more prejudicial to his Purpose, could not easily be thought of ; for if Examples have any Influence over the Actions of

(m) Gesta Regis Stephani, p. 961. W. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. l. 2. Hen. Huntingdon. l. 3. Et W. Newbrigenfis. & Chron. Saxon. ad A. D. 1137.

(n) A. D. 1138. Ord. Vitalis, l. 13. p. 916, 919.

(o) Ord. Vitalis, ibid. p. 917.

(p) Ord. Vitalis, l. 13. p. 902, 922.

(q) A. D. 1139. Ord. Vitalis, p. 920, 921.

(r) A. D. 1141.



Princes, none can more effectually deterr them from usurping on one another, than a Reflexion upon the many Troubles and Difficulties *Stephen* was forced to struggle with. The two first were the only Years of his Reign, which were free from the Calamities of War; in which respect the whole Nation is (t) said to have submitted to him, and own'd him for their King. But what was this Submission? Even such a one, as is made to Torrents and Inundations, when they cannot be resisted: And for the same Reason, every sudden and powerful Invasion may be thought to be approved of, when it is not opposed. *Stephen*, by the Assistance of a potent Party in *England*, seizes the Crown, whilst the true Heir is in a distant Country, and her Friends were wholly unprepared to assert her Right. In these Circumstances they comply with the Usurper, and promise Fidelity to him. But did they believe this to be their Duty? Did they act herein upon the Doctor's Principle; viz. *That Possession made him their Lawful King*? No certainly; the contrary is most evident: For no sooner did the *Empress* arrive in *England*, and demand the Crown as her Right; but (t) they immediately repair'd to her, notwithstanding their late Engagement to *Stephen*; and served her afterwards with untainted Loyalty, till they had secured the Succession to her Son. Very true, says the Doctor; but herein they were guilty of a *Revolt*; they acted against their Oaths to *Stephen*; and ought to be look'd upon as Rebels. This is a very hard Censure; not only without Proof, but against the Faith of History; which assures us, that those that quitted the Party of *Stephen* for that of *Maud*, did it upon this Principle, That their first Oath to her remained still in Force, and could not lose its Obligation by their subsequent Oath to *Stephen*. This appear'd in none so remarka-

(s) R. Hoveden, p. 481.

(t) Tho. Wikes Chronicon, ad A.C. 1138. Proceres quoque regni, quorum animus jurisjurandi transgressione vacillabat, providâ deliberatione sibi conciliabat, sc. *Matilda Imperatrix*.

It may not be amiss to set down the Names of the chief Nobility, who declared for *Maud* the *Empress*, and adhered to her Interest, notwithstanding their Oaths to *Stephen*; viz. Robert Earl of Gloucester, the Earls of Chester, Hereford, and Es-

sex: Baldwin de Redvers held Exeter and the Isle of Wight against him. Hugh Bigod, the Castle of Norwich. Jeffery, surnamed Talebot, the Castle of Hereford; William de Mohun, that of Dunster; William Louvel, Castle-Cary; and Paganellus, Robert de Nichole, Eustachius filius Johannis, Willielmus filius Alani, defended the Castles of Ludlow, Wareham, Melhune, and Shrewsbury; besides several others. Vide H. Huntingdon l. 8. Ord. Vitalis, &c.



ble, as in *Robert Earl of Gloucester*, Natural Son to King Henry I. who justified the Assistance he gave the *Empress*, chiefly upon (u) this Reason, that he had *been sworn to her*; and therefore was bound in Conscience to serve her against *Stephen*. Now it must be granted, this had been a poor and wretched Evasion, unworthy of Countenance from Persons, that pretended to Honour, and indeed common Sense; were the Doctor's Notion of the *English* Constitution true, and had it been generally received in those Times: For then their Duty to the *King in Possession* would have cleared all Objections, and removed every Scruple, which could possibly arise from the Consideration of their Oath to the *Empress*; and whatever Attempts had been made to place her in the Throne, would have been so many Invasions of the *Laws* of their Country. Well; but if the Nobility were bound by their Oaths to *Maud*, we must condemn them for taking one to *Stephen*; which the Doctor thinks is a (x) *severe Reflexion on our Ancestors*; because we must then say, *they either did not understand their Duty, or did not practise it*. But how can we help it, if our Ancestors were guilty of some Actions, which cannot be defended or justified? Were they the only *Sinners* in the Universe in that respect? Or is it a Shame for us to confess, what we can never hope to conceal? Faulty we are sure they were upon one Account or other, either in swearing to *Stephen*, or in revolting from him; and therefore, since it is not possible for us entirely to acquit them of both these Actions; the best Service we can do for them, is to shew they were sorry for the Crime they had committed, and endeavour'd to atone for it by their subsequent Loyalty: And for this we have the Testimony of the Writers of those Times, who tell us, that those who departed from their Oaths to *Stephen*, when the *Empress* landed, did it for no other Reason, but because they thought they were bound to it in Conscience. That this was the (y) real Motive, upon which *Robert Earl of Gloucester* declared War against *Stephen*, I have already observ'd; and must therefore wonder, how it came to pass, that the Doctor

(u) Will. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. l. 2.

(x) *View of the Engl. Const.* p. 6, 7.

(y) Animabant nimirum mentem ejus multorum Religiosorum responsa, quos super negotio consuluerat: nullo

modo eum posse sine ignominia vitam presentem transigere, vel merere beatitudinem futura, si paternae necessitudinis Sacramentum irritum haberet. W. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. c. 1.



should make this *Earl's* Oath to *Stephen*, an Argument for the Support of his Cause; especially, considering, that the Historian, who is most to be depended on in this Point, has assign'd different Reasons for that Nobleman's Conduct, throughout this Affair. (z) He tells us, That *Robert Earl of Gloucester* was with King *Henry* in *Normandy*, when that Prince died; and that he did not come into *England*, till some Months after *Stephen* had been crown'd. (a) He speaks of it, as a Matter well known to him, That *Robert* deliberated with himself for some while, what Course he should steer in the Difficulties, which then surrounded him; for he saw plainly, that he could not yield himself a Subject to *Stephen*, without violating his Oath to his Sister; and on the other hand, should he refuse to make his Submission to *Stephen*, he should not only be incapable of doing the Empress and her Son any Service; but expose himself to great Dangers and Inconveniencies. For *Stephen* being now Master of those immense Treasures, which King *Henry* had been hoarding up for many Years; and being withall very liberal, not to say prodigal, in his Temper; it could not be avoided, but he must be very formidable, by the great Quality, as well as Number of his Adherents; and therefore it would be in vain to think of opposing him at present, by open Force and Violence. It was necessary therefore for the *Earl* to dissemble his Intentions for some while, and consequently to do Homage to *Stephen*; which he perform'd under this Condition, that no Injury was offer'd to his Honour and Dignity, and the Promises made to him were kept inviolably.

THUS we see *William of Malmsbury* abandons his *Earl* (for whom he had otherwise a particular Esteem,

(z) Will. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. c. 1.

(a) Idem ibid. Eodem anno post Pascha, Robertus Comes Gloucestræ venit in Angliam, cujus prudentiam maxime Stephanus verebatur. Is dum esset in Normanniâ, multâ cogitatione fatigârat animum, quidnam sibi saper hoc negotio statuendum putaret. Si enim R. Stephano subderetur, contra Sacramentum, quod Sorori fecerat, videbat fore: si refragaretur, nihil Sorori vel Nepotibus profuturum, sibi certè immanitèr nociturum intelligebat. Habebat enim Rex immensam vim thesaurorum, quos multis annis Avunculus ag-gesserat, &c. hanc copiam gazarum habenti auxiliares deesse non poterant: præsertim cum esset ipse in dando diffu-

sus, & (quod minimè Principem decet) Prodigus. Currebatur ad eum ab omnium gentium Militibus, & à levis armaturæ hominibus, &c. --- Et jam Proceres Angliæ in ejus assensum pronis mentibus transferant. Erat quidem anxius Prudentissimus Comes, ut illos delicti argueret, & ad sanio-rem sententiam præsentì colloquio revocaret. Nam viribus obviare nulla, propter præfatas causas, dabatur facultas; cui nimirum nec in Angliam venire liberum erat, nisi quasi defectionis eorum particeps, mentis suæ arcanum ad tempus dissimularet. Itaque Homagium Regi fecit, sub conditione quâdam, scilicet quamdiu ille dignitatem suam integrè custodiret, & sibi pacta servaret, &c.



and Honour) to the Courtesy of his Reader, without any Apology for his Submission to *Stephen*, but what a Regard to his Interest, and the Necessity of Affairs could help him to. He says, *he was resolv'd to keep his Oath to his Sister, and do what he could for her Service, even at the Time he swore to Stephen*; that is, (b) he desired to be thought one of her Enemies, that he might the better act the Part of her Friend. And is it not then evident, that this Earl of *Gloucester* could not possibly act upon the Doctor's Principle? For by Vertue of that, his former Oath to *Maud* would have been absolutely void, and of no Obligation; but he declares himself of a quite contrary Opinion in this Part of his Management: He believ'd he could not be releas'd from his Oath to his Sister, even when he took one to *Stephen*; and did not pretend to justify his Fidelity to her, upon any other Consideration. It is apparent therefore, that his Example is by no means to be imitated, because not to be defended; for by the Confession of his greatest Admirer and Advocate, he was guilty of manifest Perjury: But then I hope the Doctor will not take it amiss, if I think him very excusable, for what he did afterwards, in Favour of his Sister; for surely, if he believ'd himself bound by his Oath to her, he had Reason to promote her Interest upon all proper Occasions, and to do his utmost to place her in the Throne.

(b) Will. Malmsb. ibid. Quasi defectionis eorum Particeps mentis suæ arcenum ad tempus dissimulabat.

LET me add farther, as an evident Proof, that the Doctor's Principle was not understood and approv'd of in those Times; that (c) *David* King of *Scotland*, though reduced to great Difficulties by his Adherence to the *Empress*, could never be prevail'd with to renounce his Oath to her, and take a new one to *Stephen*; insisting upon it to the last, that he was obliged to the inviolable Performance of it. Now had it been the current Doctrine of that Age, that whoever was in full Possession of the Throne, was to be obeyed; he would have been sensible of the Injustice and Folly of exposing himself to Dangers, for a Lady, whose Claim to his Service immediately ceased, from the very Moment her Adversary had made himself entire Master of *England*.

(c) Sim. Dunelm. contin. p. 262. Fide dignum R. David arbitratus est, vincere vel mori pro Sacramento, quod juravit Hæredibus Henrici Regis.

AND now I may appeal to the impartial Reader, whether any Inferences can be justly drawn, from what I have hitherto observed, that can encourage the Doctor



*The Hereditary Right of the*

to hope for Assistance from this Reign. Great Numbers (says he) of the Nobility, the Clergy and People of England submitted to Stephen, and swore Fealty to him as their King; but great Numbers likewise of the Nobility, &c. who had thus sworn to him, soon after took up Arms against him, as an Usurper. So that here is Fact against Fact, and Example against Example; and the Question is, which of the two is to be regarded, as most justifiable, and worthy of Imitation: If we are to believe the Doctor, Allegiance was due to Stephen; and therefore they only were good Subjects, who kept their Oaths to him; and the Breakers of them Rebels; but his Adversaries are of a contrary Opinion; for they think it more reasonable to affirm, that the Oaths taken to him were unlawful; and upon that account they highly approve of the Behaviour of those, who abandon'd Stephen for the Sake of *Maud*. This is the true State of the Controversy, as it presents itself to us from the View we have hitherto taken of Stephen's Reign; and consequently we are yet to seek for the Satisfaction promised from it.

AND the Mischief is, the farther we carry our Enquiry into the History of this King, the more we find our Expectations disappointed. Stephen, in the Sixth Year of his Reign, was taken Prisoner at the Battle of *Lincoln*; and then the Empress, being Mistress of his Person, seem'd to be so of the Kingdom too; the Bishops at least, and the whole Ecclesiastical State, were of this Opinion; for they (d) immediately took care to make their Peace with the Empress; swore Fidelity to her, and (e) excommunicated all that adhered to Stephen. So far, it must be confess'd, the Doctor may have Reason to believe his Cause prosperous; and the Truth is, the great Bishop of *Winchester* urged it as an Argument to the Clergy, why they should swear Subjection to the Empress; viz. (f) because the Kingdom would be in Danger, if there was no Governor. So that it was the Publick

(d) W. Malmsbur. Hist. Nov. l. 2. *Invocatâ itaque primò, ut par est, in auxilium Divinitate, filiam Pacifici Regis (sc. Matildam Imp.) in Angliæ Normannique Dominam eligimus, & ei fidem & manuteneamentum promittimus.* Malmsbury says, he was present at

this Council; and that not only all the Bishops were assembled in it; but also many of the Abbots and Archdeacons.

(e) W. Malmsbur. *ibid.*

(f) W. Malmsbur. Hist. Nov. l. 2. *Ne Regnum vacillet, si Regnante careat.*



Good, and Necessity of Affairs; that brought them to this Compliance; which is all the Doctor contends for; But I must beg Leave to observe to him, that before this Council was assembled, the (g) Archbishop of Canterbury being solicited to make his Submission to *Maud*, and own her Title, made Answer, *That he could not do it with Honour, till King Stephen had releas'd him from his Oath of Fealty he had taken to him; and therefore he, and many of his Prelates, with some of the Laity, took a Journey to the King, to conferr with him upon that Affair; who gave his Consent, that they should yield to the Necessity of the Times.* Thus it is evident, they did not think themselves at Liberty to turn over their Allegiance to *Maud*, till they were admitted to do it by *Stephen*; to which alone that unanimous Recognition of her Title in the Synod of *Winchester*, which presently after ensued, is to be imputed. Is it not then apparent, that the (h) Doctor's Principle had nothing to do in this Transaction? for that would have operated immediately, as soon as *Maud* was in Possession, without any Hesitation or Delay; and the Archbishop would never have given himself the Trouble of a Journey to *Stephen*, to ask that, which the Constitution of the Kingdom obliged him to: Besides, if the Example of the Prelates, and the Clergy of this Reign, is to prescribe to Posterity; it will not only be lawful to swear to every Prince in Possession, but to desert him too, whenever an Opportunity offers; for within a few Months after this solemn Promise of Fidelity to the *Empress*, made in a full Synod, the good Bishop of *Winchester*, finding his Brother's Party to be in a Condition to make Head against the *Empress*, takes an Occasion of quarrelling with her; defeats her little Army at *Winchester*; and obliges the brave Earl of *Gloucester* to surrender himself a Prisoner. The Consequence of which Victo-

(g) *Paucis post diebus Theobaldus Cantuariæ Archiepiscopus venit ad Imperatricem; disfulis sanè fidelitatem Dominæ facere; inconsulto Rege aliàs divertere, fama & Persona sue indignum arbitratu. Itaque & Ipse & Plerique Praesules, cum aliquantulis Laicis, permissi ad Regem ire & colloqui, dignantèrque impetratâ veniâ, ut in necessitatem temporis transirent, in Sententiam Legati cessere.* W. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. l. 2.

(h) It may be fit here to observe, that *Maud*, when she was in Possession, never

took upon her the Title of Queen; but either retained that of *Empress*, or else called herself *Domina Anglorum*; the Lady of the English; as appears from our Histories, and several of her Charters still extant. And yet the Great Council of the Kingdom own'd her Title; and swore Fealty to her: Which shews, the Doctor is mistaken, (Vind. p. 106.) when he affirms, in the Case of *Cromwell*, that by the Constitution of our Monarchy, he who had not the Royal Title, could not have the Legislative Authority.



ry was, that the *Empress* was forced to give *Stephen* his Liberty, that her Brother might obtain his; and this was no sooner done, but the whole Body of the Clergy assemble again; by the Authority of the Legate, (i) revoke all their Promises and Oaths to *Maud*, and swear afresh to *Stephen*. (k) What must we now think of this nimble Change in the Bishops? Was this effected too by the Doctor's Principle? Certainly no: For the mutual Enlargement of King *Stephen*, and the Earl of *Gloucester*, was agreed to upon (l) these Terms; *That Maud should keep the Lands and Castles she was then in Possession of; and both she and Stephen might defend their Pretensions as well as they were able.* So that *England* was then (m) divided between them; and either we must say, they were both in Possession, or neither. If *Stephen* was King *de Facto* of his Part, so was *Maud* Mistress *de Facto* of Hers; and therefore those Bishops, whose Dioceses were in her Division, could never justify their taking Oaths to *Stephen*, upon the account of Possession. The Truth is, though these Bishops did all along favour the Cause of *Stephen*, before that of *Maud*; yet at the latter End of his Reign, they plainly made a Distinction between him, and a King *de Jure*; for being then, in a general Council, (n) requested by him, to consent to the Coronation of his eldest Son *Eustachius*, in order to defeat the Designs of Prince *Henry*; they peremptorily refused to gratify him in this Point; alledging for their Excuse an express Prohibition, which they had received from the Pope, who would

(i) W. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. l. 2.

(k) W. Malmsb. says likewise, *They excommunicated all that adhered to Maud.* Ibid.

(l) W. Malmsb. ibid. Ad ultimum eo modo res ventilata, ut quis conditionibus & Rex & ipse absolveretur; nullo pacto alio interveniente, nisi ut quique partes suas pro posse, sicut prius, tutarentur. Et pag. sequ. Tum demum Robertus assensit; ita tamen, ne quicquam Castellorum vel terrarum redderetur, quod post Regis captivum in jus Imperatricis, vel quorumque fidelium ejus transferat.

(m) Chron. Saxon. ad A. D. 1140. Tunc fuit Anglia multum divisa: nonnulli tuebantur partes Regis, nonnulli Imperatricis; cum enim Rex erat in Carcere, opinati sunt Comites & summi Viri, eum nunquam iri liberatum; ideoque fœdere facto cum Imperatrice, de-

duxerunt eam in *Oxford*, & in ejus potestate oppidum posuerunt.

(n) Convocato apud Londoniam Generali Concilio, Theobaldo sc. Archiepiscopo Cant. Episcopis quoque & Proceribus Angliæ, proposuit animo filium suum *Eustachium* regio Diademate insignire, & de jure debito & jurato Henricum prævenire, & penitus privare. Postulatus autem a Prædicto Archiepiscopo & cæteris Episcopis, quos ibidem congregaverat, ut *Eustachium* filium suum in Regem ungerent, & benedictione sua confirmarent, repulsam vehementer indoluit. Dominus siquidem Papa literis suis Cantuariensi prohibuerat Archiepiscopo, ne filium Regis, qui contra jusjurandum regnum usurpasset videbatur, in Regem sublimaret. Hen. Huntingdon. p. 395. Gervaf. Do- robern. p. 1371.



by no means permit, that *the Father, who had obtain'd the Crown by Perjury, should be succeeded by his Son*. From whence, I say, it is evident, they would not allow a King *de Facto* the same Rights and Privileges, which belong to a King *de Jure*; for the Son of a King *de Jure* has an undoubted Title to the Succession, which no Subjects ever presumed to dispute: But the Bishops did not think, that was *Stephen's Case*; and therefore would not consent, that his Son should inherit the Crown after him. And now I hope the Reader will be able to judge, how dangerous it is, to make the Actions, even of the greatest Subjects, a Proof of the Constitution in any Reign. In this of *Stephen*, (o) we find the Bishops and Clergy pretended to the sole Authority (where the Pope did not interpose) of making and removing Kings; and they took upon them to dispose of the Allegiance of the Subject, whenever they judged it necessary; or thought they might do it with Safety. But will any one infer from hence, that such Proceedings were warrantable by the Laws of *England*? Or that Oaths taken to a Person, that has the Power in his Hands, are to be considered only as the Effects of Fear and Compulsion; and are therefore of no Obligation? And yet this was one of the Arguments the Bishops insisted on for their Justification, in the contrary Oaths they took to *Maud* and *Stephen*. But their chief Plea on these Occasions, was the Pope's Authority, to which they profess'd an absolute Obedience. The Doctor is pleas'd to (p) affirm, *That his Adversaries had not proved, that this pretended Power of Popes, in setting up Kings, was ever practised; or that in Obedience to any such Papal Injunctions, Subjects had ever sworn Allegiance to Non-Hereditary Kings*. But he must allow me to say, they had very good Evidence for this Assertion; and it is somewhat strange, the Doctor should overlook it, in his Perusal of *William of Malmsbury*: For that Historian (q) tells us, that when *Stephen* had recovered the Throne, *Henry Bishop of Winchester*, the Pope's Legate, held a Council of *Bishops*, in which (notwith-

(o) W. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. l. 2.  
The Legate tells the Council: Ventilata est hesternò die causa secretò coram majori parte Cleri Angliæ, ad cujus jus potissimum spectat Principem eligere, simulque ordinare.

(p) Defence, p. 25, 31.  
(q) W. Malmsb. Hist. Nov. l. 2.  
Auditum est lectas in eo literas Domini Apostolici, quibus modestè Legatum argueret, quòd liberare fratrem suum dissimulasset; delicti tamen superioris gra-



standing their former repeated Oaths to *Maud*) they all declare for *Stephen*; and this they did in Obedience to the *Pope's Command*, whose Letter was read before them. And some Years after, when *Stephen* endeavour'd to get his Son crown'd, the (r) Bishops absolutely refused it; alledging for their Excuse, that they *had received express Orders from the Pope, never to comply with such a Proposal*. I might produce farther Testimonies, to shew the great Influence the *Pope's Commands* had over the Prelates, and even some of the Nobility too, in this Reign; but would it from thence follow, that the *Pope's Deposing Power* was then establish'd by Law? That it was a Part of our *Constitution*? And that none could be Lawful Kings, but such as were advanced to the Throne by his Consent and Approbation? If this was really the Case, it must be confess'd, *Maud* had a very ill Cause; and so has the Doctor too; for then, it seems, *Stephen* was a *Lawful King*, by the *Pope's Authority*; not by Virtue of his being in *Possession*.

THESE Reflexions upon *Stephen's* Reign, have arriv'd to an Extent beyond my Design and Expectation; but I hope it will be consider'd, that being the first King from the Conquest, who was truly and properly King *de Facto*, it was highly requisite, his Story should be examin'd with Care and Exactness; for tho' the Doctor has thought fit to pass it over with very little Notice; yet with his Leave, I should imagine it very reasonable to expect, some Discoveries might be made of the Authority of Kings *de Facto* in his Reign, if it had been own'd and allow'd by the *Constitution*. The Event indeed is by no means favourable to the Doctor; and I am persuaded, the Reader will be of the same Opinion. I shall now only add the following short Observations; and then shall put an End to this troublesome Reign.

THE first is taken from a Passage in our Historians, who speaking of the Agreement between King *Stephen*,

tiam facere, & magnopere cohortari, ut quocunque modo, vel Ecclesiastico, vel Sæculari, posset, ad Germani liberationem accingeretur. ----- Itaque jubere (sc. Legatum) se, de parte Dei & Apostolici, ut Regem voluntate populi, & assensu Sedis Apostolicæ inunctum, quantis possent viribus; nexè juravente turbatores verò Pacis, qui Comitissæ Aude-

gavensi faverent, ad Excommunicationem vocandos, &c.

(r) Dominus siquidem Papa literis suis Cantuariensi prohibuerat Archiepiscopo, ne filium Regis, qui contra iurandum regnum usurpasse videbatur, in Regem sublimaret. Hen. Huntingdon. p. 395. Gervas. Doroborn. p. 1371.

and



and Henry Duke of Normandy, tell us expressly, That by (s) Virtue of that Accommodation, and not sooner, Stephen became a *Rightful King*; which shews, they did not believe his *Possession* had made him so before. Secondly, When Henry II. obtain'd the Crown, he deposed the Noblemen made by Stephen, as meer imaginary, false Earls, and Lords; and resumed also the Lands granted to them by that King, tho' King de Facto: And all this was done for this sole Reason; viz. because Stephen was an Usurper; and (t) therefore his Acts ought not to be prejudicial to the Lawful King; As the Chronicle of Normandy, the Book of the Abbey of Waverly, Mr. Selden out of them, Guil. Neubrigenfis, and Chron. Brompton, inform us. This Remark was long ago made by Mr. (u) Selden, and Mr. (x) Prynne, Names of great Authority in our History, and who can never be suspected of Partiality in this Controversy. On the other hand, Maud the Empress had created (y) Milo, Earl of Hereford; (z) Gaufrid de Magna Villa, Earl of Essex; and (a) Robert de Sigillo, Bishop of London; of which Honours we do not find, that Stephen pretended to deprive them; and we are sure the Bishop continued in Possession to the Time of his Death, which was not till Ten Years after.

THE next King, whose Title I am now obliged to enquire into, is Henry II. (b) whom the Doctor is pleas'd to reckon among his *Non-Hereditary*, or *de Facto* Kings, for these two Reasons: First, Because his Mother Maud the Empress, from whom he derived his Right, was living in the fourteenth Year of his Reign. Secondly, Because the Royal Family of Scotland, being descended from Edgar Atheling's Sister, were before him in Blood; and therefore ought to have enjoy'd the Crown. But if it should appear, that these undoubted Heirs entirely resign'd up their Rights and Pretensions; I hope then the Doctor will allow Henry II. to be a Lawful King, without

(s) W. Neubrigenfis, l. i. c. 30. p. 105. Walt. Hemingford. c. 76. Et Johan. Brompton, Chron. p. 1037. Quibus, Deo propitio, solenniter actis, R. Stephanus tunc quasi primò jussu Angliam recepit. Matth. Paris, p. 86. ad A. D. 1153. Justitià de cælo prospiciente, Rex Anglorum Stephanus, & Dux Normannorum Henricus, apud Wallingford in Concordiam convenerunt.

(t) Chartæ Invasoris præjudicium le-

gitimo Principi minimè facere debent. J. Brompton, Chron. p. 1046.

(u) *Tales of Honour*, p. 538.

(x) Prynne's Register of Parl. Writs, Part 1. p. 240.

(y) Rymer Fœdera, &c. Tom. 1.

(z) Camden's Britannia.

(a) Sim. Dunelm. p. 269. Gervaf. Dorobern. p. 1355. Godwin de Præsul. & Wharton de Episc. Lond.

(b) *Defence of his View*, p. 163, 164. having



having Recourse to his Hypothēsis. That the *Empress* had a just Title to the Crown, after her Father's Decease, is not to be disputed; for all imaginable Care had been taken, to secure the Succession to her, by the Oaths of all the Prelates, and Nobility: And therefore she claim'd it as her Birthright; and would never yield up the quiet Possession of it to *Stephen*. But we have likewise a well-grounded Assurance, that she never intended to sit longer in the Throne, than till her Son became capable of the Government. This was probably the Reason, why she would not take upon her the Title of *Queen*, even when her Enemies were at her Feet, and she seem'd to be entirely in Possession of the Kingdom; for upon any other account to have declined a Coronation, (c) considering the Disposition and Temper of those Times, might have proved very prejudicial to her Interest. During the tender Age of her Son, she was contented to endure the Fatigues of a Military Life for several Years; but at length, having lost her two great Supporters, the Earls of *Gloucester* and *Hereford*; and being tired out with (d) Vexations and Disappointments, she resolves to leave *England*, and to spend the rest of her Days in Peace and Quietness with her Husband in *Normandy*. So that now it was plain, the future Prosecution of the War against *Stephen*, was wholly devolved upon her Son; and it seem'd but reasonable, that the Crown of *England* should be the immediate Recompence of his Trouble in acquiring it. About (e) two Years after his Mother's Departure, Prince *Henry* landed in *England*, upon the *English* Nobility of his Mother's Party having declar'd, that they would not stir, till he (f) who had the Right, return'd into *England*: On his Arrival, tho' then but Sixteen Years of Age, many of the Nobility discover'd their Inclinations to him; (g) *because, of Right, all belong'd to him; and they were desirous of securing*

(c) *Angli nisi coronati Rege serviri non erant soliti.* Ord. Vitalis, l. 3. p. 503.

(d) Imperatrix jam Anglicanæ discordiæ tædio affecta, in Normanniam transfretavit, malens sub tutelâ mariti sui in pace quiescere, quàm in Angliâ tot molestias sustinere. Gervaf. Dorobern. p. 1363. ad A. D. 1147.

(e) Gervaf. Dorobern. ad A. D. 1149.

(f) Gervaf. A. 1149. p. 1366. *No-*  
*lebant enim Comites Angliæ & Proce-*

*res contra Regem Stephanum liquam excitare seditionem, eò quòd Robertus & Milo Comites universæ carnis viam ingressi fuerunt, & Imperatrix transfretaverat, nisi ipse, ad quem omnia de jure contingebant, in Angliam rediret.*

(g) Quia eum omnia de jure contingebant. --- Et jura Regni Henrico jam militi juvenulo conservare volebant. Gervaf. Dorobern. p. 1366, 1367.



*the Rights of the Kingdom to that young Knight.* From which Passages I may venture to infer, that his Mother had actually then made over her Title to him; for how he should have a *Right* upon any other account, is not easy to imagine. He did at that time but shew himself to them, to fix them to his Party, and then went forward into *Scotland*, to the King his Cousin, who also treated with him, as claiming the Crown of *England* in his own Right, and engag'd him by Oath, (b) if he recover'd the Crown, to let him have *Newcastle* and *Northumberland*, and all the Country between the *Tine* and the *Tweed*. In the Beginning of *January 1150.* (i) he return'd from *Scotland* into *Normandy*; and then his Father (k) *Geoffrey of Anjou* resign'd up the Dukedom of *Normandy* to him, which Dukedom *Geoffrey* had held in Right of his Wife *Maud*; and therefore it is probable, that at her Instance, at least not without her Consent, he gave it up to her Son *Henry*: And if his Mother was content to resign to her Son her Right to the Duchy of *Normandy*, of which she and her Husband were then in quiet Possession; we have much more Reason to think, she did resign up to him her Right to the Crown of *England*, which he himself was to be at the Pains of recovering by Force. He stay'd in *Normandy* and *Aquitaine* till the Year 1153, being engag'd in a War with the *French King*; and during that time the War was renew'd and carry'd on in *England*, between King *Stephen*, (l) and the Lords, that stood up against him, to preserve the Rights of the Crown for the young Duke *Henry*, as the Historian tells us: So that it appears, they had then no farther Concern for his Mother; but look'd upon the Right of the Crown as devolv'd on him; to whom, next time he came over into *England*, it was agreed by King *Stephen* himself, that after his Decease, it should accordingly descend. And nothing seems to put this Matter more out of que-

(b) Hoveden, fol. 280. b. 50. inter Scriptor. post Bed. Henricus autem filius Matildis Imperatricis jam 16 annorum Juvenis nutritus in Curia David regis Scottorum avi matris suæ, factus est miles ab eodem Rege David in Civitate Carleoli, prius dato Sacramento, quod si ipse Rex Angliæ fieret, redderet ei Novum Castellum, & totam Northumbriam; & permetteret illum & hæredes suos in pace sine calumniâ in

perpetuum possidere totam terram, quæ est à fluvio Tweede ad fluvium Tine.

(i) Gervaf. p. 1367.

(k) Diceto, p. 525. Gaufridus Plantagenest reddidit Ducatum Normanniæ Henrico filio suo. Knyghton, p. 2390. Et sciendum est, quod decimo quinto anno regni Regis Stephani, Galfridus Comes Andegaviæ reddidit Henrico filio suo totam Normanniam.

(l) Gervaf. ibid.



(m) A Geni-  
trice sua &  
Fratribus, &  
omni gente  
Normanni-  
câ, &c. debitâ  
letitiâ & ho-  
nore receptus  
est. Hen.  
Hunting-  
don, l. 8.

tion, than the (m) Joy which the Empress *Maud* express'd upon her Son's Return into *Normandy*, after he had perfected this Agreement with *Stephen*; an undoubted Sign, that he had done nothing in that Act against her Consent, much less to her Wrong and Prejudice; and yet by that Accommodation, the Succession was settled on the Son, without any manner of Regard to the Mother's Right. And if we consider the Temper of the Empress, that will still add Force to this Argument: We find this to be her Character, That she was a Princess of a very great Spirit; and her Carrying it so high upon her Victory over King *Stephen*, is a sufficient Proof of it. Now supposing that she was of that Temper, and that she had not resign'd up her Right to the Crown, but sent her Son over only to act in her Name; and he so far abus'd his Mother, as without her Authority to give away her Right for ever, reserving only the Reversion of the Crown to himself: It cannot be conceiv'd, that we should find nothing related in our Historians, either done or said by the Empress, in Vindication of her own Right; especially if we consider, that *Henry* did not stay in *England* long after the Agreement was made between King *Stephen* and him; but return'd back again soon into *Normandy*, which of all Places one would think he should not have chosen to go to, had he done his Mother, that was there, so great an Injury; nor would she have welcom'd him thither with so much Joy; but rather have shew'd her Resentment, by raising him some Trouble there. Yet we find nothing, but that he liv'd there quietly, without the least Trouble from his Mother; and stay'd there till he was sent for into *England* upon King *Stephen*'s Death; and then we have no Ground to imagine, but that his Mother gave him Joy, and wish'd him a good Voyage hither, and a happy Reign: At least, the Silence of the Historians, considering her Temper, is a better Argument, that she had given up her Right, than their not mentioning her Resignation, nor producing an Instrument of it, is of the contrary.

(n) Besides, we are told, King *Henry* put off his Expedition to *Ireland* by the Persuasions of his Mother; which can never be believ'd by those, who think she resented his Possession of the Crown. And lastly, we have evident Proof, that she took her Son's Part in his Quarrel against

(n) Chroni-  
con Nor-  
manniæ,  
f. 991. ad  
A.D. 1154.  
anno primo  
Hen. secun-  
di.



gainst *Thomas Becket*. In the *Cotton Library* there is an (o) ancient and very valuable Collection of Letters, by *Thomas Becket* and others, relating to his Case; in (p) one of which it appears, that King *Henry* had complain-  
 ed to his Mother against the Archbishop, and that she reproved *Nicolas de Monté*, the Archbishop's Friend, very sharply upon that Account. Surely this was no Sign of any Misunderstanding between the Son and the Mother; but rather an undeniable Testimony of the mutual Confidence there was between them, since the Injuries done to the one were resented by the other; which could never possibly have happen'd, had the *Empress* look'd upon her Son as an *Usurper*.

(o) Biblioth: Cotton.  
 Claudius, B. 2. Et vide Bishop Stillingfleet's Answer to Mr. Cressy's Epistle Apologetical to a Person of Honour, p. 380.  
 (p) L. 1. Ep. 49.

Secondly, That the House of *Scotland* ever laid any Claim to the Crown of *England*, upon the account of their Descent from *Margaret*, the Sister of *Edgar Atheling*, no where appears; on the contrary, it is an undeniable Truth, that *David* King of *Scotland* (Nephew to *Edgar*) swore to the *Empress Maud's* Succession; asserted her Right to it, to the manifest Hazard of his own Kingdom; and at length, by his steady Adherence to her Cause, and his Fidelity to her Son, with whom he made the Agreement just now mention'd, contributed very much to his Advancement to the Throne. Which Actions, if they were not good Evidences of his having quitted all Pretensions to the Inheritance of *England*, it was certainly impossible for him to give any that would have been good.

Thus far I have endeavour'd to clear the History of our Kings, from the Conquest; and perhaps have succeeded in my Design; which was to shew, that the Subjects had Reason to obey them, as Lawful Sovereigns, *Stephen* only excepted, without the Help of the Doctor's Principle. But if I presume too much upon the Strength of my Arguments, I have this Comfort however, that the Doctor will not be able to overthrow their Probability at least; which I cannot but think necessary for him in this present Undertaking. For were it only uncertain, whether *William I.* and his Sons, had a Legal Title to the Crown, (without regard to their Possession); this very Uncertainty would be a sufficient Confutation of what he has urged from their Reigns; because his boasted *Constitution* absolutely depends upon the undoubted

id. 2 (o)  
 294. 108

id. 2 (o)  
 294. 108



(q) See his  
Defence,  
p. 21, &c.

ed Existence of Kings *de Facto*, who were submitted to and obeyed, for no other Reason, but upon the account of their being in the Throne: But the Doctor cannot be sure, the Subjects did not think themselves bound in Conscience, to pay their Allegiance to these Princes upon other Considerations, besides their *Possession*; and consequently his Cause is far from being secure. He is pleas'd indeed to expect, we should demonstrate the Rights of these Princes; and therefore (q) complains of one of his Answerers, *That he had not proved, that the Subjects submitted to certain Kings* (whom he had called Kings *de Facto*) *upon the Score of Hereditary Right, or of any Right at all, antecedent to their Possession, which* (says he) *of all things he ought to have done.* But by his Leave, his Adversaries will never think it their Duty, to prove the Rights of Princes, more than of any private Men; which, by the establish'd Rules of Equity, ought always to be presumed, and taken for granted, till the Contrary is made evident. On the other hand, none are to be esteemed Criminals without Conviction; and yet such were certainly all Kings *de Facto*; for the Kingdoms then possess'd, did of Right belong to another, from whom they were forced by Violence, and withheld by notorious Injustice. Since the Doctor therefore has thought fit to charge so many of our Kings with this Crime; it becomes him to make it good by undoubted Testimonies and Authorities; otherwise he denies them that Justice, which the Laws of all Countries allow to the meanest Subjects, who are ever reputed Innocent, till the Guilt they are accused of, is clearly detected, and manifested.

(r) See his  
View, p. 95,  
&c.

(s) Bishop  
Stillington's  
Unreasonableness  
of a new Separation,  
&c. p. 32, 33.

THE Doctor perhaps may now expect, I should follow him through his whole List of Kings *de Facto*; but since he has not thought it worth his while, to take much Notice of them himself; he will excuse me, if I pass them over with as little Regard. (r) He has been pleas'd indeed to draw an Argument from a Passage in our Homilies relating to King *John*; and (as the (s) Bishop of *Worcester* had done before him) urges it as a Proof, That the *English* Clergy in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, thought Allegiance was due to King *John*, as a Lawful Prince; *because they call him the Subject's Sovereign Lord the King; and their Natural Lord the King of England:*



England; whereas it is well known, that King John was no more than a King in Possession; for Arthur, who was his elder Brother's Son, and put up a Claim against him, with his Sister Eleonore, who was kept in Prison all his Reign, were nearer in Blood to the Throne, than himself. But let the Doctor be as confident as he pleases; we have very good Authority to affirm, that King Richard (t) appointed his Brother John his Successor, by which Testamentary Right (according to ancient Custom) he might become a Lawful King, and therefore John pretends to have succeeded *Jure Hereditario*. In the next place it appears, that (u) Arthur very early submitted to King John, and did Homage to him; and (x) I find an Instrument cited out of Chopinus, which shews, he acknowledged John to be King of England; upon which my (y) Author makes the following Reflexion: Truly if Arthur had not thought John a Lawful King, he would not in time of Enmity so have term'd him; but he must needs repute him a Lawful King, when at Vernon, the French King being present, he did Homage to John, as to the King of England his Sovereign Lord. Now as the Bishop of Worcester, and the Doctor ask, why we may not do as much for any King *de Facto*, as the People of England did for John: So I would be informed in my Turn, whether the Subjects could do less, than call him King, and obey him as such; since Arthur, the true Heir, had done so before them. And why might not this be the Reason, that the Convocation bestows the Title of King upon John; and speaks of him, as a Lawful Sovereign? Besides, the Doctor has been told, that were John no more than a King *de Facto*, it was still unlawful for the Pope to curse him; to absolve the Subjects from their Allegiance to him; and give the Kingdom to the Dauphin of France, which are the chief Points the Homilies intended to condemn. For their Design was, to censure the Pope's Interposition in the Affairs of England, and to reject his pretended Authority in disposing of the Obedience of

(t) Dr. Brady at the End of Richard I. and History of the Succession, p. 377.

(u) Matth. Paris, p. 200.

(x) In Serjeant Fairfax's Confutation of Serjeant Brown's Errors, upon the Stat. 25 Edw. 3. of Children born beyond Sea, (a MS. written in Queen Elizabeth's Time) this Record is recited out of Cho-

pinus: Arthurus Dux Britannia, Comes Andegavia, &c. Noveritis, quod feci charissimo Domino meo Philippo Regi Francie illustri Homagium Ligeum, &c. de feodo Britannia, &c. quando Deo volente ipse & ego ea acquisiverimus contra Johannem Regem Anglia.

(y) Serjeant Fairfax. ibid.



Subjects; and therefore it does not follow, because they disallow of the *Barons* transferring their Allegiance to the *Dauphin*, at the Pope's Instigation; that therefore they held it unlawful for them, to prefer *Arthur's* Title to *John's*. But then the Doctor thinks, they would not give *John* the Name of King; much less would they honour him with the Appellation of their Natural Lord and Sovereign, had they not believ'd, that Possession gave him a sufficient Title; for by Descent it was impossible he should have any; *Arthur* and his Sister (his elder Brother's Children) being living. But with all due Respect to the learned Bishop and Doctor, I must take the Liberty to say, they

(z) *Arthur* died A. D. 1202. The *Barons* invite the *Dauphin*, A. D. 1216. *Math. Paris.* (a) She died in Prison, A. D. 1241. *M. Paris.*

are much mistaken, when they affirm, that (z) *Arthur* was alive, when the *Barons* invited the *Dauphin* into *England*; that Prince having been dead fourteen Years before. So that the only possible Bar to King *John's* Title, must be *Eleonore*, *Arthur's* Sister; (a) who was indeed living many Years after *Henry III.* possess'd the Throne. Upon which account (unless King *Richard's* Power to dispose of the Succession be allowed) I shall not pretend to defend King *John's* Possession of the Kingdom, against a Right so manifest, as hers was; which it does not appear, she had ever surrender'd: Tho' at the same time, I cannot but think it strange, if there had been no manner of Objection against her Title, that neither the Pope, nor the French King, nor the *Barons* of *England*, in their frequent Quarrels with King *John*, and his Son, should ever set up that Lady's Claim against them, and reproach them with Injustice to her; which yet they do not seem to have ever done, as far as we can learn from the Histories of those Times; nor indeed does it appear, that *Eleonore* ever laid Claim to the Kingdom. But I am not solicitous about this Matter; and therefore shall, without any Difficulty, agree with the Doctor, if he insists upon it, that King *John* was no better, than a King *de Facto*, at the Time we are speaking of; his Niece being still living. But is it impossible, that the Authors of this Homily should, through Ignorance or Inadvertency, think better of King *John's* Title, than it deserved? Might they not believe, that *Eleonore*, as well as her Brother, was then dead; and consequently, that his Right was not to be disputed? This Consideration was suggested to the Doctor by one of his Adversaries, but without



without any Success; for the (b) Doctor thinks it a Reflexion upon the learned Compilers of the Homilies, to imagine, *they were not as well acquainted with the History of that Age, as we.* Now, tho' I will never allow the Doctor to have more Reverence and Esteem for those Authors, than myself; yet I can easily believe, they were mistaken in this Point of History; and my Reason is, because I find them guilty of a much greater Error, in this very Passage, that is now before us. If he will be pleased to cast his Eye upon this Part of the Homilies, he will be sensible, they reproach the *Barons*, &c. with taking up Arms for the *Dauphin* against King *John*, at the Instigation of the Pope; whereas it is a Truth not to be called in Question, (if *Matthew Paris* may be credited) that the Pope discourag'd that Rebellion to the utmost; and at last excommunicated the Promoters and Fomenters of it. The Methods made use of by him to suppress those Insurrections, are so copiously related by that Historian, that it may well seem wonderful, they should slip out of the Memory of the Writers of this Homily; but they might easily be supposed ignorant of the Time, when *Eleonore* died; because she is hardly mention'd by that Author, throughout his whole Account of King *John's* Reign; and when he takes Notice of her Death under *Henry III.* he does it in so few Words, that it might easily escape a diligent Reader's Observation. If any should be offended with the Liberty here taken with the Homily; I must again assure my Reader, it proceeds not from the least Disaffection to the Composers, much less to the Doctrine of it, which is the only thing we are obliged to maintain; not the Arguments made use of to prove it. So that it still remains true, that the Pope had no Authority to absolve the People of *England* from their Allegiance to King *John*; and whoever took up Arms against him, by Virtue of any such Command or Injunction, was guilty of Rebellion; tho' it is also certain, that the Pope never advised the War maintained by the *Barons* for the *Dauphin*; but on the contrary, censured, and condemn'd it. Lastly, the Doctor insists upon it, that to call *John* King of *England*, and *Natural Lord*, and *Sovereign*, are evident Signs, they thought him to be a *Rightful King*. But this Consequence, as to calling *John* King of *England*, is not so certain,

(b) Defence;  
P. 139.



certain, as the Doctor takes it to be; for the Historians, that did not believe *Stephen* had a Right to the Throne of *England*, always give him the Title of *King*; even *Maud* the Empress herself, (c) in her Charter to *Milo of Hereford*, styles him *King of England*; tho' at that Time he was her Prisoner. And it is worth observing, that the Scripture tells us, that *Ishbosheth* reigned Two Years, and *Athaliah* Six; but nobody will infer from thence, that he was a Lawful *King*, or she a *Queen*: And which is still more remarkable, (d) *David* calls *Absalom* *King*; and yet surely he never acknowledged, he was so *de Jure*. I must desire likewise, it may be consider'd, whether the Word *Natural* is applicable to a *King de Facto*; for my (e) Lord Chief Justice *Coke* teaches us, That *Natural Allegiance* is due originally by *Nature and Birthright*; and he that oweth this, is called *Subditus Natus*; and therefore in an Indictment for *Treason* against *J. Dethick*, 2d and 3d of *Philip and Mary*, it ran, *Contra Philip. & Mariam supremos Dominos suos*; where *Naturales* was omitted, because *King Philip* was not his *Natural Liege Lord*. From whence it seems plain, that *King John*, having no Title by Birthright, could not properly be called the *Natural Lord*; and *Sovereign of the People of England*; and therefore the Writers of the *Homilies*, when they speak of him in those Terms, did believe he had a Right, by *Blood*, to the *Crown*; or else we must say, they did not truly consider the Propriety of that Expression.

I now proceed to the House of *Lancaster*; and shall examine the several Observations, which the Doctor is pleas'd to think for his Purpose, in the History of that Family. (f) He begins his first Remark with a Reflexion upon the Conduct of Bishop *Merks* of *Carlisle*: Of all the Great Men (says he) we meet with in our History, none was more likely to have stood out against the Government of a *King de Facto*, than that Bishop; and yet it is certain, that he sate

(c) Rymer. Tom. i. p. 8. *Matilda* Imp. Hen. R. filia & Anglorum Domina. Hanc autem Donationem feci ei apud Oxineford, &c. Pro servitio suo quod mihi fecerat, & ita quod tunc habebam in captione mea apud Bristol. Regem Stephanum, qui Dei misericordia & auxilio Roberti Com. Glocest. fratris mei, & auxilio ipsius Milonis & aliorum Baronum meorum captus fuit, &c.

Test. Theobaldo Archiepiscopo Cant. Roberto Episcopo Lond. Alexandro Episcopo Lincoln. Bernardo Episcopo Sancti Davidis, Nigello Episcopo Eliensi, Davide Rege Scot. Roberto Com. Glouc. Reginaldo Com. Cornubiz.

(d) 2 Sam. xv. 19.

(e) In Calvin's Case.

(f) *Viz*, p. 4.



in Henry IV.'s first Parliament, in which those Acts were past, that we have in the Statute-Book; for it was at the Close of that Parliament, he made his Speech in Behalf of King Richard; and some time after pleaded that King's Pardon for a Conspiracy against him, for which he stood condemned to die. And (g) a little after; It is a great Mistake to think, <sup>(g) View</sup> there were any Nonjurors in the Numerous Party, that espoused <sup>P. 5.</sup> the Title of the House of York; for all the Partizans of that House lived in Submission, and took Oaths of Allegiance to the Three Henry's. Would not any one now conclude from these confident Passages, that the Doctor had Demonstration on his side; and that it could never be disputed, but that this Bishop of Carlisle had acknowledged Henry IV. and sworn Allegiance to him? But what if the Doctor had really no Foundation for these bold Assertions? And there is in Truth no manner of Evidence, that ever this Bishop took an Oath, or submitted to Henry IV. Have we not then good Reason to complain of the Injury done to that Prelate's Memory? And will it not become the Doctor to make him Reparation? It is a hard Case, that a Person, so highly (h) honoured in History, and so much revered by the ablest and most impartial Judges, should at last be called to an account, and fall under the Doctor's Censure, for an Action universally applauded, without the least Contradiction, for more than Three Hundred Years; surely the Arguments should be very powerful, that can easily ruin so well established a Reputation; and nothing but the irresistible Force of Truth could prevail with the Doctor to rob his Country of so glorious an Example of Fidelity and Fortitude. Well; it is in vain to spend Time in Expostulations, if the Matter of Fact is really as he represents it; his Proof of which I shall now consider. Thomas Merks, Bishop of Carlisle (says he) submitted to Henry IV. and acknowledged his Authority; for he sate in his first Parliament, &c. But how does it from thence follow, that he must have submitted to Henry IV? The Doctor knew very well, that no Qualifying Oaths were then required of Peers at their Entrance into Parliament: And by a late Example he might have been satisfied, that his Appearance in Parliament (I might call it a Convention; for I shall prove it to have been no better by and by) was no Argument, that he approved of their

(h) See Hall's Chronicle. Godwin de præsulibus Ang. Lord Chief Justice Coke's Inst. p. 2. c. 15. De Art. Cleri. Bishop Stillingfleet's grand Question; p. 146.



Proceedings: For he cannot be ignorant, that several of the *Deprived Bishops* attended some Days in the late Convention; and yet they neither acknowledged the Authority that summoned it; nor concurred with it in its Resolutions. The Doctor adds, *He did not make his Speech, till the Close of the Parliament; and from thence infers, that he was present in the preceding Part of that Session, when many of Richard II.'s Acts were repealed.* This is just as good an Argument, as the former; in which he takes it for granted, that every Lord gives his actual Consent to every Act, that passes. Besides, how does he know, that this Speech was made at the Close of the Parliament? And if it was, why must it from thence follow, that he was present in the Beginning of it? These are all meer Conjectures, without any Support from History; and therefore may as well be denied by others, as they are affirmed by the Doctor. Lastly, The Doctor urges it against this Bishop, *That he afterwards pleaded the Pardon of Henry IV. for a Conspiracy against him, for which he stood condemned to die.* And what is the Consequence the Doctor would draw from thence? Does it follow, that he thereby acknowledged him to be a Rightful King; or engaged himself to be his true and faithful Subject for the future? Might not a Man condemned by *Cromwell* for serving King *Charles II.* have pleaded a Pardon granted by that *Usurper*, without the Imputation of owning his Authority? Or is it absolutely necessary in such a Case, that a Man should be hanged, in order to shew his Loyalty? For what other Event can be expected, if he must accept of no Pardon; which, it often happens, must be pleaded, before it becomes effectual? But how comes the Doctor to know, that Bishop *Merks* ever pleaded *Henry IV.'s Pardon*? In what Writer or History is it to be found? Mr. *Rymer* (to (i) whose Collections he refers his Reader) only gives us the Copy of the *Pardon*, without any Intimation, that he ever pleaded it; so that we are yet to seek for Authority for this Piece of History. It may be, the Doctor thinks, there could be no other Motive for this Pardon, but only the Assurance he had given *Henry IV.* of becoming his good Subject for the future: But why then was it not inserted in the Pardon? Why was that Reason omitted? Instead of which, the only Cause



Cause assigned for that *Act of Grace*, is (k) the great Reverence that King had for the *Pontifical Dignity and Character*. After all, the Doctor (l) thinks this Bishop *inexcusable in taking up Arms*; since the Earl of March (for whose Sake only, as Right Heir to Richard II. it was lawful to levy War against Henry IV.) never set up his Claim to the Crown, in all that Reign; and his Exclamation upon this Occasion is not a little insulting: *What then becomes of Bishop Merks?* But what becomes of the Doctor, if Richard II. was alive at that Time, when this Bishop appeared in Arms against Henry IV; is it not then evident, that our exact Historian is subject to the same Frailties he charges upon his Adversaries? Now that Richard II. was then alive, is certain from undoubted Authorities. For, First, We have the Testimony of one, that (m) flourished in those Times; who says it expressly, that when Bishop Merks's Party was defeated, King Richard was so mortified at the News of that Misfortune, that (as was reported) he voluntarily fasted himself. And, Secondly, To put this Matter out of Question, we have the Word of Henry IV. himself, in the (n) forementioned Charter of Pardon; in which it is said, the Bishop's Crime was *conspiring with Thomas Blount, Bennet Sealy, Knights, and many others condemned at Oxford, to restore King Richard*. It was Richard II.'s Title therefore, not the Earl of March's, which the Bishop was concerned to defend; and consequently his Observation about that Earl's Submission to Henry IV. is nothing to his Purpose, were it true: And whether it is so or not, shall be examin'd in its proper Place.

I SHALL beg Leave to conclude this Defence of Bishop Merks, with that short History of him, which my Lord Chief Justice Coke has inserted in his *Institutes*. (o) *At the Parliament holden the First Year of Henry IV. on the first Thursday after the Bishop of Canterbury had*

(k) Rymer's Fœdera, &c. Tom. 8. p. 165. Nos attendentes, qualiter præfatus Thomas Merk Pontificalis dignitatis caractere est insignitus, & divino cultui quasi in summo gradu mancipatus, & volentes proinde ob Dei reverentiam, & statûs sui fastigium, rigorem Justitiæ Regalis Clementiæ mansuetudine temperare, opinantes indubiè magis Deo gratum existere interdum misereri & parcere, quàm continuè judicium san-

guinis exercere, de Gratiâ nostrâ, &c. Pardonavimus eidem Episcopo, &c.

(l) Defence, p. 4.

(m) Walsingham, Hist. Angl. in Hen. 4. p. 363. Richardus cum audisset hæc infortunia, mente consternatus semet ipsum extinxit inedia voluntariâ, ut fertur. See also, J. Hall's Chronicle, Fol. 13.

(n) Rymer. Fœdera, Tom. 8. p. 165.

(o) Part 2. c. 15. de Artic. Cler.



willed the Lords, that in no wise they should disclose any thing, that should be there spoken; the Earl of Northumberland demanded of the Lords, what were best to be done for the Life of Richard II. Thus far are the Words of the Roll of the Parliament. At this Time spake that worthy Prelate (p) John Merks, Bishop of Carlisle; and (q) said, That they ought not to proceed to any Judgment against King Richard, for Four Causes. First, That the Lords had no Power to give Judgment upon him, that was their Superior, and the LORDS Anointed. Secondly, That they obey'd him for their Sovereign Lord and King Twenty Two Years, or more. Thirdly, If they had Power to give Judgment against him, they ought in Justice to call him to his Answer; for that (said he) is granted to the cruellest Murderer, or errantest Thief in ordinary Courts of Justice. Fourthly, That the Duke of Lancastre had done more Trespas to King Richard and his Realm, than King Richard had done to him or them, &c. and desir'd, that if they would proceed against him, the Names of them, that so would proceed, might be entred into the Parliament Roll. It is true, that the Parliament Roll omitteth this Speech of the Bishop; but it appeareth by the Parliament Roll, that the Lords proceeded against King Richard, and adjudged him to perpetual Prison; whose Life they would by all means to be saved, as the Roll reporteth. The Names of the Bishops, and Lords, and Knights, that assented, are set down, as the Roll of the Parliament reports; so as it seemeth, that the stout and resolute Speech of the worthy Bishop wrought some Effect. For this Speech he was arrested by the Earl Marshal; and being for a small time committed to the Custody of the Abbot of St. Albans, was soon delivered. (r) Against him never any Judicial

(p) It should be Thomas Merks.

(q) The Original known Authority, upon which the Truth of this Story of the Bishop of Carlisle and his Speech depends, is J. Hall's Chronicle, written in Henry VIII.'s Reign; but that Historian does not tell us the certain Time, when this Speech was delivered; and therefore, tho' the Doctor will have it, that it was at the Close of the Session; and Sir Edward Coke believes he has rightly guessed at the true Occasion of it; yet it is possible, for any thing that appears to the contrary, that it might have been delivered at the Beginning of that Parliament; and the rather, because the Roll sets down the Name of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, who voted at the Time Sir

Edward Coke mentions; among which the Bishop of Carlisle's does not occur.

(r) Tho' it does not appear, that any Judicial Proceeding was had against the Bishop of Carlisle for this Speech; yet we are very well assured, that within two Months after Henry the Fourth's Accession to the Crown, he was deprived of his Bishoprick of Carlisle, and translated to a poor one of little or no Value, by the Pope's Authority; this is affirm'd by Walsingham. (Hist. Angl. in Hen. IV. p. 364.) And we find the Temporalities of Carlisle were order'd to be surrendered to Will. Strickland, 15. Novemb. primo Hen. Quarti. (Rymer. Foedera, &c. Tom. 8. p. 106.) In January following we meet



Proceeding was had for this Speech in Parliament. But this Bishop, transported with Excess of Zeal, and affectionate Desire of the Enlargement and Restitution of King Richard, was Party and Privy to the Conspiracy of Thomas Holland Earl of Kent, John Holland Earl of Huntington, John Montacute Earl of Salisbury, Edward Earl of Rutland, Thomas Lord Spencer, &c. for which he was indicted of High Treason, arraign'd, try'd, and had Judgment, as in Case of High Treason; but the King pardon'd him, and set him at Liberty. Such was the Opinion this great Lord Chief Justice had of Bishop Merks; in Consideration of which, together with the other Remarks I have now made upon his Case, I shall take the Liberty to believe, he never swore Allegiance to Henry IV. notwithstanding, (s) the Doctor's Confidence, that *there were no Nonjurors in his Reign*. I shall only now add, for the Doctor's particular Information, that tho' he is pleased to censure this Bishop's Appearance in Arms against Henry IV. as a Breach of his Oath, and an Act of Rebellion; yet the Records of Parliament speak of it in a different manner; for (t) there it is said, *That all those, that levied War with the Earl of Salisbury, the Lord Despenfer, &c. did therein perform their Faith and Allegiance to their Liege Lord King Richard, according to their Duty to God, and to the Laws and Customs of the Realm of England*. I hope, after so ample a Declaration in Parliament, in Defence of this Bishop, the Doctor will no more disturb his Ashes; but suffer him to enjoy quietly that Honour and Reputation, which has hitherto been thought his Due.

AND now the Doctor must give me Leave to complain a little of his Severity to his Adversaries; for he has imposed it as a Task upon them, *That they should prove, there were any Nonjurors in the Times of his Kings de Facto*: And with much Assurance he seems to (u) boast,

with him in the Tower, (Rymer, *ibid.* p. 121.) from whence, in June, he was committed to the Custody of the Abbot of Westminster. (Rymer, *ibid.* p. 150.) Now this early Deprivation from his Bishoprick cannot, with Probability, be attributed to any other Cause, besides the Liberty he took in his Speech, or his Refusal to do Homage to Hen. IV: For the Treason, for which he was indicted, was not committed, till after St. Nicolas Day, which was the 6th of December. (Rymer, *ibid.*

p. 165.) and, consequently, his Deprivation bore Date before it. It may be here observed, how highly the Pope favoured Henry the Fourth's Title; since He deprived Bishop Merks for not submitting to him; and that contrary to an express Act of Parliament, made by Richard II. against Translations of Bishops by the Papal Authority.

(s) View, p. 2. And Defence, p. 33, 34.

(t) Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4. & 32.

(u) Defence, p. 33, 34.

T

that



that they had not succeeded in their Attempt. Surely this is a rigorous Exaction, and unworthy of the Doctor's Equity and Moderation; for at this rate we must be obliged to prove Mens Honesty and Innocence, which by the established Rules of Justice ought always to be presumed. Besides, we are at present in *Possession*, (a Consideration, which ought to be of some Weight with the Doctor) for till he was pleased to cast the first Stone at this worthy Bishop, a clearer Character had never been transmitted in History, than what he enjoy'd; and that purely upon the account of his Loyalty and Fidelity to his Rightful King. We may therefore take it for granted, that he really was, what he has hitherto, without the least Contradiction, been represented to be, a *Man of Conscience and Integrity*; and leave it to the Doctor's Skill and Management; to give Light to those Spots and Blemishes, he pretends to have discovered in him. For the same Reason I may be allowed to believe, there were many more *Nonjurors* among the great Men, that took up Arms against *Henry IV.* or lived in his Reign, till the Doctor produces his strong Arguments to the contrary. But however, that I may not omit any thing, which the Doctor thinks necessary for his Satisfaction; I will give him another Instance of an eminent Person, who chose to lose a great Employment, rather than submit to *Henry IV.* as his Lawful King; and that was (x) *Sir John Cary, Chief Baron of the Exchequer*, at the Time of *Richard II.*'s Deposition; who was banished by that Prince for no other Reason, but because he would never own his Authority. This Case, I presume, will merit the Doctor's Consideration; for here we have a Judge so little acquainted with the *Doctor's Constitution*, that he suffers himself to be deprived of his Fortune and Country, rather than he would do *Fealty* to a King *de Facto*. I may likewise add, that (y) several Clergymen were in Arms against *Henry IV.*; and the (z) *Friars Minors* did generally favour that King's Enemies: Now I should think it allowable to call these *Nonjurors*; since in those Days the Inferior Clergy were not oblig'd to take Oaths of Allegiance. Upon which account, I must confess, it is not a little surprizing to me, to find the Doctor so often calling upon his Adversaries, to produce the Names of *Nonjurors* throughout the Reigns of his Kings *de Facto*;

(x) *Prince's*  
*Danmonij*  
*illustres,*  
 p. 152.

(y) *Rymer.*  
*Fœdera,*  
*Tom. 8.*  
 p. 333.  
 (z) *Wal-*  
*singham*  
*Hist. Angl.*  
 p. 366.



as if every individual Subject had been obliged to take the Oath of Allegiance in those Days; or all those, that had taken it, were influenced by the Doctor's Principle, that *Allegiance is due to every King in Possession*; the contrary to which Assertion I have already in some Measure shewn; and shall do it more fully in the Sequel of this Discourse. The Doctor indeed would persuade us, that (a) *William the Conqueror made every Inhabitant in England do Homage, and swear Fealty to him*. But if he had given himself Leave to consider fully of this Matter, he would have been satisfied, that *Ingulfus* (the Author cited by him) could not mean, that all Persons, without Exception, took these *Oaths of Fealty*; but only the King's principal Tenants, and other great Men, who held Lands upon Secular Services, and therefore were called *Homines Regis*: That is, such only (which the Doctor presently after confesses) as had Lands described in *Doomsday Book*. Now it is certain, the Inferior Clergy were bound by none of these Tenures; but held, whatever Lands and Possessions they had, in *Frank Almoigne*; (b) by Vertue of which they were excused from *Fealty*, and all manner of Services, besides that of Praying for their Patrons. This Privilege was afterwards (c) secured to them by the Fourth *Lateran Council*, under *Innocent III*; and that Council being received, and approved of in the Council of *Oxford* (held under Archbishop *S. Langton*, and ratified by King *Henry*) the Clergy were never disturbed in the Enjoyment of these Rights, till the Times of the Reformation: So that there could be no *Nonjurors* among the great Body of the Clergy of *England*, under any of the Doctor's Kings *de Facto*. And to what Purpose then does he so often ask, *Who were the Nonjurors in those Reigns?* Had the Clergy of *England* enjoy'd this Privilege at the Time of the late *Revolution*; near Four

(a) *Vien*, p. 2.

(b) J. Selden. in notis ad Eadmerum, p. 203. Frankalmoigne, seu Liberam Eleemosynam vocitamus, quæ ad ordinem sacrum tantummodo spectat, & neque censum, neque Fidei, quam proximis, professionem, sed præcum solummodo in Patronorum, seu Dominorum salutem effundendarum officium à clientibus exigit; ita tamen ut Civili Foro Clientis de eâ resisti non possit. In cæteris formulis quotquot apud nos aut

etiamnum extant integræ, aut vestigia sua reliquere, solennis Fidei professio Sacramento firmata jure exigitur, &c.

Coke's *Inst.* Part 1. l. 2. c. 6. Sect. 135. *They that hold in Frank Almoigne shall do no Fealty to their Lord; and the Lord is excluded from having any earthly or temporal Services of them.*

(c) Mr. Dodwell's *Considerations of present Concernment*, p. 166, 175, 183, 184.



Hundred of them had quietly continued in the Possession of their Livings, of which they were for no other Reason deprived, but because they were *Nonjurors* : And might not the next Age then have demanded, as the Doctor does of the Times beforementioned, *Who were the Nonjurors at the Revolution* ? For besides Eight or Nine Bishops, and a lesser Number of Temporal Lords, it may well be questioned, whether the rest of the Gentlemen of the Laity, who refused the Oaths, will be remember'd in our Histories. Neither were the Clergy the only Persons exempted from taking Oaths of *Faalty* in the *Conqueror's* Reign ; but also all those, that held Lands in (*d*) *Allodio*, of which we (*e*) meet with frequent Mention in *Doomsday Book*. Besides, who were these great Men, that did *Homage* to the *Conqueror* ? The *Bishops and Abbots*, &c. mention'd by *Hoveden* to have sworn to him at *Salisbury*. Had they been *Saxons*, it might have serv'd the Doctor's Purpose, supposing him to be only a King *de Facto* : But it is worth observing, that this happen'd towards the latter End of his Reign ; at which Time all the old *English* Inhabitants of Note had been dispossessed in a manner of their Estates and Fortunes ; and the *Normans* were generally seized of the Lands of the Kingdom, together with all the great Offices and Employments, Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil. This is so notorious a Truth, that none can be ignorant of it, that are but slenderly acquainted with the Historians of that Time. (*f*) *Ingulfus* assures us, *That King William distributed the Earldoms, Baronies, Bishopricks, and Prelacies of the whole Land to his Normans ; and hardly suffer'd an Englishman to arrive to any Degree of Honour or Power.* And he adds, *The Normans now hated the English at that rate, that whatsoever their Merit might otherwise be, they*

(*d*) J. Selden in *Notis ad Fadmerum*, p. 203. *Allodia* etiam omni Fidei, quæ juramento præstito fieri solet, professione libera sunt.

(*e*) Dr. Brady's *Hist. of England*, Vol. 1. p. 67. and 204.

(*f*) *Ingulfus*, p. 70. *Wilhelmus R. Comitatus, Baronias, Episcopatus, & Prelatias totius terræ suis Normannis distribuit, & vix aliquem Anglicum ad honoris statum vel alicujus dominii Principatum ascendere permisit. ----- Tantum nunc Anglicos abominati sunt Normanni, ut quantocunque merito polle-*

*rent, de dignitatibus repellerentur, & multò minus habiles Alienigenæ, de quâcunque aliâ natione, quæ sub cælo est, extitissent, gratanter assumerentur. Ipsum etiam idioma tantùm abhorrebant, quod Leges terræ statutæque Anglicorum Regum Linguâ Gallicâ tractarentur, & pueris etiam in Scholis principia literarum Grammatica Gallicè, non Anglicè traderentur, &c. More to this purpose may be found in Ord. Vitalis, l. 3. p. 527, 520, 523. and Henry Huntingdon, l. 6. p. 370.*



depriv'd them of all Dignities, and sent for worthless Foreigners from all Parts to fill their Places. And it is evident from *Doomsday Book*, that most of the Lands of *England* were then possessed by *Normans*; and consequently few besides were under any Obligation to take Oaths to the Conqueror. Lastly, It should be consider'd, that many of the *English* Nobility and Gentry, &c. voluntarily left the Kingdom in the Beginning of that Prince's Reign; before the Time, in which he is said to have tender'd the Oaths to his Subjects. A great Part of them fled into *Scotland*; some into *Denmark* and *Ireland*; and others (g) went to *Constantinople*; where they were well receiv'd, and kindly entertain'd by the Emperor *Alexius*. Now I leave it to the Doctor to judge, whether all these voluntary Exiles may not properly be esteem'd *Non-jurors*, since they chose to leave their Country rather, than they would submit to the Conqueror. But supposing it to be true, that every Man in *England* had taken the Oaths to the Conqueror, and those of his Successors, whom the Doctor calls *Kings de Facto*; is he sure they did this upon a full Persuasion and Conviction, that Allegiance was due to them upon the Sole Account of their being in the Throne? The Doctor knows very well, that many of the chief Nobility, and great Numbers of the Gentry were in Arms against *Henry IV.* chiefly for this Reason, because he was not their *Lawful King*. Now this was a plain Declaration, that they thought the Oath they had taken to him, did not oblige them; and consequently it is evident, they had no Notion of

(g) Ord. Vitalis, l. 4. p. 507. *Utro in exilium aliqui profugunt. Quidam longinquas Regiones adierunt, & militiæ Alexij Imperatoris Constantinopolitani sese audacter obtulerunt. Et p. 508. Exules igitur Anglorum favorabiliter à Græcis suscepti sunt, & Normannicis legionibus, quæ nimium Pelasgis adversabantur, oppositi sunt. Augustus Alexius urbem, quæ Chevetot dicitur, Anglis ultra Byzantium cœpit condere; sed nimirum infestantibus Normannis, eos ad urbem Regiam reduxit, & eisdem Principale Palatium cum Regalibus thesauris tradidit. Hæc igitur de causâ Saxones Angli Ioniam experierunt, & ipsi ac hæredes eorum sacro Imperio fideliter famulati sunt, & cum magno honore inter Thraces Cæsari, senatui, populoque chari usque nunc persisterunt. Et vide l. 7.*

p. 641. & l. 9. p. 725. *And for their good Services in that Country, they were for many Years made choice of for the Emperor of Constantinople's Guard. See Mr. Camden's Britannia, in the Chapter concerning the Normans. And to this purpose is Mr. Selden's following Observation; (Mare clausum, l. 2. c. 1. p. 184. Engl. Fol.) In Times past the Emperor of Constantinople was wont to have trusty Guards called Barrangi, constantly attending his Person, who were taken out of England, as appears out of Nicera's Choniates, (Hist. Græc. l. 2.) And Codinus also, who was Keeper of the Palace, writes, (De Officiis Constantinop.) That they were wont to salute the Emperor with a loud Voice, Ἰγγλινισί, in the English Tongue: Vide etiam Du Cange Gloss. voce Barrangi.*



the Doctor's Constitution: For had that been a known and established Doctrine, it is absurd to imagine, so many eminent Persons should agree in assigning that for the main Ground of their Quarrel, which was most directly contrary to Law, and therefore as unpopular a Reason, as could possibly be given. When Men take up Arms against the Government they have liv'd for some Time peaceably under, they have always thought it prudent to justify such Actions by specious and plausible Pretences; and, I believe, it will be hard to instance in any Insurrection, which has not appeal'd to Law and Equity, for Countenance at least, if not Encouragement. But if the Doctor's Opinion is to prevail, there could not be a more impudent Rebellion, than that, which was maintained against *Henry IV.* since it was grounded upon this *illegal Position*, *That he was not King de Jure, though he was in full Possession of the Kingdom.* Upon this Presumption therefore, that Men cannot act so contrary to the Principles of common Sense, as to engage in a Conspiracy against an establish'd Government, upon Reasons notoriously contradictory to that *Constitution* they pretend to maintain; the Doctor's Adversaries have taken the Liberty to affirm, that his Doctrine was not known in *Henry IV.*'s Reign: And what now does the Doctor answer to this? Why, he (b) tells us, *First*, That it could be no better, than a sham Pretence, if ever made use of by them; for the Right Heirs had all submitted to *Henry IV.*; and therefore *certainly it was no small Crime for Subjects to begin a War with their Prince, and throw a Nation into Blood and Confusion, when they had no Reason for it; and this was what they did, and what they had no Reason to do, &c.* And, *Secondly*, He says, that *Owen Glender*, the Earl of *Northumberland*, &c. did not make War against *Henry IV.* for the Sake of the Right Heir, but upon quite different Motives.

(b) *Defence*,  
P. 45, 48.

*First*, He affirms, that the Right Heirs to the Crown had all submitted to *Henry IV.*; and therefore the Taking up Arms against him upon the Pretence of their Title, was unreasonable, and unjustifiable. But did the Doctor consider, that the first Conspiracy against *Henry IV.* was during the Life of *Richard II.* in order to restore him to the Crown? And will he say, that the Resignation made by that Prince, during his Imprisonment, was

free



free and voluntary, and such as effectually released his Subjects from their Allegiance to him? I know very well, that *Richard II.* was prevail'd with to declare, that his *Resignation* was voluntary; and I am not ignorant, that it is thus enter'd upon the *Rolls of Parliament*: But I have a better Opinion of the Doctor, than to believe, he will so far approve of that infamous Act of Violence and Injustice, as to attribute any Authority to it; if he should, I must refer him, for his Satisfaction, to the Records of Parliament, where he will find the following remarkable Passages, very worthy of his Regard; and therefore fit to be frequently recommended to his Consideration. (i) *And where certain Persons of evil, riotous, and seditious Disposition, joyed in Rumour and rebellious Novelties, adhering to Henry IV. late in Deed, and not of Right, King of England, after his Unrighteous, Unlawful, and Detestable Usurpation and Intrusion, against his Faith and Liegeance to King Richard II. his Righteous, True, and Natural Liege Lord, murder'd with great Cruelty and horrible Violence, in an outrageous and heady Fury, the Right Noble and Worthy Lords, John Montague, late Earl of Salisbury; and Thomas, late Lord Le Despenser, and other true Subjects and Liegemen of the said King Richard, &c.* . . . . . Item. *Ralph Lumley, and others, were cruelly slain and murder'd by Henry IV, in Deed, and not of Right, King of England, for the true Faith, Duty, and Allegiance, that they bare to the Right Noble Prince King Richard II, &c.* By Virtue of which Authorities I shall venture to say, that those, who took up Arms for *Richard II.* (notwithstanding his pretended *Resignation*) had a good and righteous Cause; and therefore the Doctor has unjustly cast upon them the Aspersions of being *seditious*, and *unreasonable Men*. Well; but after *Richard II.*'s (k) Death, he is confident the following Insurrections against *Henry IV.* were not capable of any Justification; for the *Earl of March* (the only Person who could pretend to a Right to the Crown) never laid any Claim to it: (l) So far from it, that he took the Field for *Henry IV,* against *Owen Glendwr*; a Sign he had surrender'd his Title.

Now, with all the Doctor's Accuracy, I am afraid he is unfortunate in this Piece of History: For (m) *Roger* (m) *Sir W. Dugdale's Baronage,* *Earl of March* dying at the End of *Richard II.*'s Reign, his

(i) Rot. Parl. 1. Edw. 4.

(k) Defence, P. 47, 48.

(l) Ibid. P. 45.



his eldest Son *Edmund* was then but Six Years old ; and consequently (n) under Ward all *Henry IV.*'s Reign : And Sir (o) *William Dugdale* tells us farther, that he was but Ten Years old, when he headed the *Herefordshire* Men in Opposition to *Owen Glendor* ; an Age certainly too young, to render the Resignation of a Crown of any Validity. Besides, why must the Earl of *March*'s Heading an Army against *Owen Glendor*, be necessarily interpreted, as a Declaration in Favour of *Henry IV.*'s Title ? The Doctor should remember, that King *Henry* was not of his Opinion ; for when he was ask'd to ransom (p) the Earl of *March*, (who had been taken Prisoner by *Owen Glendor* in that Action) (q) he made Answer, That the Earl of *March* was not taken Prisoner for his Service ; but willingly suffer'd himself to be taken Prisoner, because he would not act against *Owen Glendor* ; and therefore he would not ransom him, nor redeem him. But to put this Matter for ever out of Dispute ; we have an Act of Parliament upon Record, which expressly commends those, who (after (r) King *Richard*'s Death) continued their Faith and Liegeance, according to their Duty to GOD, and to the Laws and Customs of the Realm of *England*, to *Edmund Mortimer*, then Earl of *March*, (s) next Heir of Blood to the same King *Richard*. And likewise it is there said, that *Ralph Lumley* and others were cruelly slain and murder'd by *Henry IV.* in Deed, and not of Right, King of *England*, for the true Faith, Duty, and Allegiance, that they bear to the

(n) This is evident from Mr. Rymer's *Fœdera & Conventiones*, &c. Tom. 8. For p. 268. 3<sup>o</sup> Hen. Quarti, A. D. 1402. Sir Hugh Waterston is appointed Governor of the King's young Children, and also of his Kinsmen the Earl of March and his Brother : And, p. 591. 10<sup>o</sup> Hen. Quarti, the Custody of several Mannors in Dorsetshire is granted to Henry Prince of Wales, till Edmund Mortimer Earl of March is of full Age. P. 608. The Earl of March and his Brother were first committed to the Custody of Sir John Pelham, allowing him 500 Marks every Year ; but Henry IV. in the Tenth Year of his Reign, commits them to the Custody of his eldest Son, granting him the same annual Sum. And, vide p. 639. Jo. Harding also in his Chronicle, cap. 194, 196. says, Roger Earl of March being slain in Ireland, 22<sup>o</sup> Ric. 2. left two Sons very young. J. How says the same ; Annals, p. 319.

(o) Sir William Dugdale's *Baronage*.

(p) It is observable, that King Henry took care to appoint Commissioners to treat with Owen Glendor for the Ransom of the Lord Grey of Ruthin, soon after he was taken Prisoner ; by which means he was quickly set at Liberty for 10000 Marks. Rymer's *Fœdera*, &c. Tom. 8. p. 279. His Refusing therefore to do the same for the Earl of March, could proceed from no other Reason, but this Jealousy of him, or his Friends.

(q) Hall's *Chron.* fol. 20. and Holinhead, p. 521. Walsingham, (ad A. D. 1402.) says, The Earl of March was then taken, prodicione mediante. Stow says, That, when it came to Martial Affairs, the Earl of March's own Archers turn'd their Hands against them they should have defended. Stow's Annals, p. 327.

(r) Rot. Parl. 1. Edw. 4.

(s) Ibid.



Right Noble Prince King *Richard II.* in his Days; and after his Decease, unto *Edmund Mortimer*, late Earl of *March*, &c. I leave it now to the Doctor to consider, whether those Noblemen, who took up Arms in Defence of the Earl of *March's* Title, were guilty of no small Crime, and had no reason for so doing, which yet he has been pleased with great Assurance to affirm.

Secondly, He (t) maintains, that *Owen Glendor*, the Earl of *Northumberland*, &c. did not make War against *Henry IV.* for the Sake of the Right Heir; but upon quite different Motives. Let us now therefore enquire into the Truth of this Assertion. He (u) says, *That Owen Glendor's War began with a Riot, and ended in Rebellion.* Now, though I am not at all concerned, whether this be true or no; yet if any thing can be said in that *Welsh Gentleman's* Vindication, I hope I may do him Justice without Offence. I shall beg Leave therefore to recommend the Perusal of the following Passage, extracted out of the Notes of the Learned and Judicious Antiquary, *Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt Esq;* (x)

*SIR David Gam* (y) was wholly devoted to the Interest of the Duke of *Lancastre*; upon which account it was, that *Owen ap Gryffydd Vychan* (commonly called *Owen Glyn-Dŵr*) was his mortal Enemy. This *Owen* had his Education at one of the Inns of Court, and was prefer'd to the Service of King *Richard II.* whose *Scutifer* (as *Walsingham* says) he was. *Owen* being assured, that his King and Master *Richard* was Deposed and Murder'd, and withal (z) provoked by several Affronts, and Wrongs done him by the Lord *Grey of Ruthin* his Neighbour, whom King *Henry* very much countenanced against him, took Arms; and looking upon *Henry* as an Usurper, caused himself to be proclaim'd Prince of *Wales*. And tho' himself were (a) de-

(t) *Defence*, p. 45, 48.

(u) *Ibid.* p. 45.

(x) See *Mr. Lhwyd's Additions to Brecknockshire*, in the last Edition of *Camden's Britannia*.

(y) 13<sup>o</sup> Hen. Quarti, *Luellyn ap Howell*, the Father of *David Gam Esq;* procures a Commission from *Henry IV.* to treat with *Owen Glendor* for the Ransom of his Son *David Gam*, then *Owen's* Prisoner. *Rymer's Fœdera*, &c. Tom. 8. p. 753.

(z) *Dr. Powell*, in his *History of Wales*, assures us, *That the Quarrel between the Lord Grey of Ruthin and Owen*

*Glendor first broke out in Richard the Second's Time; and that the Lord Grey presuming upon Henry the Fourth's Favour, was guilty of the first Acts of Hostility against Owen Glendor: If this Account is true, the Doctor is much misinformed, when he makes Owen the Aggressor, and Author of this Riot, as he is pleased to call it, in Henry the Fourth's Reign. See his Defence*, p. 45.

(a) *Dr. Powell* says the same, in *Owen Gwyneth*, p. 213. but then he confesses, (*ibid.*) that he was descended by Females from *Owen Gwyneth Prince of North-*



## The Hereditary Right of the

‘scended paternally but from a younger Brother of the  
‘House of *Powis*; yet (as Ambition is ingenious) he finds  
‘out a Way to lay Claim to the Principality, as descend-  
‘ed (by a Daughter) from *Llewellyn ap Gryffydd*, the last  
‘Prince of the *British* Race. He invaded the Lands,  
‘burnt and destroyed the Houses, and Estates of all  
‘those, that favoured and adhered to King *Henry*, &c.”

IF this Account may be rely’d on; whatever Rebellion *Owen Glendwr* was guilty of, certainly it could not be against *Henry IV*; for he never own’d him for his King; much less did he ever swear to him. And it is observable, that in some of those Papers, signed by him as Prince of *Wales*, (which are preserved and printed by Mr. *Rymer*, in his Volumes of *Fœdera, Conventiones, &c.*) he never calls him (b) other, than Duke of *Lancastre*. With respect therefore to *Henry IV*, he was truly a *Non-juror*; and cannot be charged as a Revolter; a Name, which the Doctor thinks he has a Right to bestow upon all, that took up Arms in this Reign. It may be said indeed, that his Taking upon himself the Title of *Prince of Wales*, and dating all his Writings according to the several Years of his *Principatus*, was no less, than an Invasion of the Sovereignty of the Kings of *England* over *Wales*; and therefore may well be term’d an Act of Rebellion: But if it was so, he was answerable for it only to the Earl of *March*, to whom only he could be a Rebel, and not to *Henry IV*. And then it deserves to be consider’d, whether the Earl of *March*’s (c) voluntary Surrender of himself to *Owen*, (if *Henry IV*. himself is to

*Wales*, and by his Mother from *Rees ap Theodor Prince of South-Wales*, p. 216. *Leland* (Itinerar. Vol. 5. p. 36.) makes him to be descended from *Lluelin ap Iorwarth Prince of All Wales*, by a Daughter.

(b) Particularly in the Treaty made between *Owen Glendwr* (by his Ambassadors *Griffin Young Dr. of Laws*, and *John Hanmer his Cousin and Esq;*) and the King of France, they expressly unite themselves against *Henry of Lancastre* their common Enemy. Anno 5 Hen. 4. *Rymer*. Tom. 8. p. 356, 365.

(c) It must be confessed, that one of the Reasons given by the Earl of *Northumberland* and his Son, for their War against *Henry IV*. was, because he did not take care to ransom *Edmund Earl of March*, who had been taken Prisoner by *Owen Glendwr*, and was at that Time cruelly kept

in Prison, bound with Iron Chains: From whence it may well be inferr’d, that *Owen* could not then be a Friend to the Earl of *March*’s Cause, who had so little Respect for his Person. All that I can say in this Matter is, That *Henry IV*. (in the Passage before cited) believed the contrary; and alledged it as a Reason for his not ransoming that Earl, that willingly and designedly he threw himself into *Owen*’s Hands; which being allowed to be true, it is not easy to conceive, that *Owen* should lay him in Chains. Besides, *Walsingham* says expressly (p. 367.) That the Earl of *March* join’d with *Owen* against King *Henry*, and also married *Owen*’s Daughter; but this last Particular is not much to be credited, upon the account of the Earl’s Age; tho’ I find *Holinhead* believes it, p. 521. and *Stow*, p. 320.



be credited) and the (d) good Correspondence between that *Welsh* Gentleman and my Lord *Percy*; (the professed Friend of the forefaid Earl, as I shall shortly shew) may not amount to a Probability, that he presumed upon the Rightful Heir's Consent (as far as he was then capable of giving it) for assuming that high Title. This is what I think may justly be pleaded in Behalf of *Owen Glendor*; and if this Point is allowed me, I shall then think it no longer a Question, whether his Quarrel against *Henry IV.* was chiefly founded upon that King's Usurpation; which the Doctor has thought fit utterly to deny. (e) From all which duly considered, I may justly infer, that the *Welshmen* at that Time were a very formidable Body of *Nonjurors*; being (f) entirely united in their Enmity against the House of *Lancastre*; not only in *Wales*, but in every Part of *England*, where they resided. For (g) we find it complain'd of in Parliament; that the *Welsh* Scholars in both Universities, left their Colleges; and the Apprentices in *London*, and elsewhere, their Masters, in order to engage themselves in the Quarrel of *Owen Glendor*. And a few Years after, (h) *John Trevor*, Bishop of *S. Asaph*, approved so well of his Countrymens Cause, that he deserted *Henry IV.* upon that Account.

(d) Plac. Coron. 7 Hen. 4. n. 12. It is said, the Earl of Northumberland was in a Confederacy with the Rebels of Wales. And Walsingham says, (Hist. Angl. p. 368.) That the Lord Percy, &c. marched into Shropshire with a Design to join Owen Glendor, and the Earl of March; who is mentioned by Sir William Dugdale (from Stow) to have been with the Lord Percy in the Battle of Shrewsbury. See also Rymer's Fœd. &c. Tom. 8. p. 313, 314.

(e) If what Owen Glendor pretended had been true, that the Principality of Wales belonged to him by Right of Blood; his Case would still be more capable of an Apology, whilst an Usurper was upon the Throne of England. But I find Dr. Powell will by no means allow of this Pretension, p. 318. who affirms, That Mortimer Earl of March had the best Title by Birthright to the Principality of Wales, as well as to the Crown of England, p. 315.

(f) My Lord Herbert says, the Welshmen adhered to the House of York; by

which he must mean the opposite Interest to the House of Lancastre. Life of Henry VIII. p. 373. And a great Ornament to the Bench at this Time, has publicly declared his Opinion to this purpose, upon a memorable Occasion. The Britains, says he, were always Men of Courage and Sincerity, and yet of Resentment; tho' Henry IV. and Henry V. were martial Princes; and had a Hatred against the Britains, because they persevered in their Duty to Richard II. who was their rightful, tho' unfortunate King, and made most scandalous and reproachful Laws against them: Yet it is worth Remark, that those Kings had never peaceable or happy Days, until they reconciled themselves to that Great People; than whom none had more eminently signalized their constant Loyalty to their Rightful King. Mr. Price's Speech against the Grant of Part of the Principality of Wales to the Earl of Portland, p. 14.

(g) Rot. Parl. 2 Hen. 4. 15.

(h) Walsingham. Hist. Angl. p. 370. and Godwin de Præsul.



BEFORE I conclude this Story of *Owen Glendor*, I beg Leave to correct a Mistake concerning him, which all our common Chronicles and Histories have fallen into; and that is, (i) "That in the Tenth Year of King Henry's Reign, *Owen Glendor* being driven to such Misery, that in a manner he despaired of all Comfort; he fled into desert Places, and solitary Caves, where being destitute of all Relief and Succour, dreading to shew his Face to any Creature; and finally, lacking Meat to sustain Nature, for meer Hunger and Lack of Food, he miserably pin'd away and died." Now we have very good Evidence; that this Story is false; for in (k) the Eleventh Year of *Henry IV*, we meet with Orders to march against *Owen Glendor*, and attack him: (l) And in the Thirteenth of the said King a Commission is issued out for the Redemption of *David Gamme Esq*; at that Time *Owen's* Prisoner. Besides, we are well assured, he survived this Prince, and continued his Hostilities against his Successor; for in the (m) Third Year of *Henry V* a Commission was issued out for a Treaty with him and the *Welsh*, in order to bring them to Obedience; and about (n) half a Year after, the same Commission is renewed to *Sir Gilbert Talbot*, to conferr with *Meredyth ap Owen*, the Son of *Owen de Glendourdy*, in order to the Pacifying of the said *Owen*, and the *Welsh* Rebels, by Offers of Pardon, if they desired it, &c. Thus it is manifest *Owen Glendor* was in no despicable Condition in the Middle of *Henry V's* Reign: How long he afterwards lived, and in what Circumstances he died, no Histories that I have hitherto met with, do inform us: But there is Reason to believe, he never made his Submission to the House of *Lancaster*; because (o) in *Henry VI's* Reign a severe Act of Parliament passed, in

(i) These are *Holinhead's Words*, p. 536. and *Stow*, p. 338.

(k) *Rymer. Fœdera*, Tom. 8. p. 603.

(l) *Rymer. ibid.* p. 753.

(m) *Rymer. Tom. 9.* p. 283.

(n) *Rymer. ibid.* p. 330.

(o) *Rot. Parl. 9 Hen. 6. 32.* Please it the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, to be remember'd of the great Insurrections, Rebellions, and horrible Treasons imagin'd and done by *Owen Glendourdy of Walys*, against the Royal Majesty of King *Henry*, Aiel to our Sovereign Lord the King that now is, whereof he was indicted, &c. Please

it you it move be ordeyned, &c. that all Indictments against the said *Owen* be affirmed, &c. and be effectual to bind the Heirs of the said *Owen*. --- Considering also, that the said Insurrections, Rebellions, &c. imagined and done by the said *Owen*, were not only in Destruction, and Ameyntissement of the Riall Estate of the said King *Aiel*, but also of the Prince, that Time our Liege Lord, that last past fro this Life, and of all the Branches of the Stock Riall, &c. and finally in Destruction of all English Tongue for evermore, &c.

which



which his Crimes are recited, and all Indictments, Judgments, &c. made or given against him, are confirmed.

IN the next place, the Earl of *Northumberland*, his Son *Hotspur*, and the Earl of *Worcester* his Brother, fall under the Doctor's Indignation; for he does not scruple to charge their Revolt from *Henry IV.* with Ingratitude, and Envy: And in a word, is very positive, (p) they did not act upon Principles of Loyalty to the Right Heir, but quite different Motives. This must be confessed to be an Accusation highly reflecting on the Honour of that very illustrious and noble Family. *Hotspur* especially methinks, might have challenged some Reverence from the Doctor, whose (q) Valour is still remember'd with Pride by his Countrymen, and well deserves to be immortal. The Doctor, however, is resolved to give him no Quarter; but as he is the first Enemy, that durst use him so contemptuously; I doubt not, but he will have Reason to repent of his Error, which I shall now endeavour to make him sensible of.

IN order to this, I shall beg Leave to lay before the Reader an Extract taken from a (r) Manuscript Copy of *John Harding's Chronicle*, omitted in the printed Edition of that Author; which, together with some additional Observations, will, I imagine, not a little contribute to the Vindication of those noble Lords. The Extract is as follows:

“Forasmuch as many Men mervaile gretely, why  
“the Erle of *Northumberland*, and Sir *Henry Percy* his  
“furst begottyn Son, and Sir *Thomas Percy* Erle of *Wor-*  
“*cester*, were Supporters to King *Henry IV.* to have his  
“Heritage, and to take King *Richard* to have depose him  
“by strong Honde: Truly I the Maker of this Book  
“was brought up fro Twelve Year of Age in Sir *Henry*  
“*Percy's* House to the Battle of *Shrewsbury*; where I

(p) *Defence*, p. 43; 46, 48.

(q) A greater Proof was never given of the English Valour, than in the Battle of Otterbourne, otherwise called Chevy-Chace, (at the latter End of Richard the Second's Reign) when *Henry Percy*, alias *Hotspur*, who commanded the English, was at last taken Prisoner by *Montgomery*; (Ancestor to the present Earl of *Eglington*.) In this Action *William Douglas* the Scotch General, and the greatest Part of his Army, were slain. This is

*Mr. Camden's Account*. *Britannia*, in *Northumberland*, p. 850. The Battle of *Homildon* was a few Years after fought by the same Lord *Percy*; in which he routed the Scots, and took *Archibald Douglas*, their General, Prisoner.

(r) *Biblioth. Harley*, 42. c. 11. fol. 152. *Mr. Camden* also in his History of this Earl of *Northumberland* and his Son, at the End of *Northumberland*, refers to *John Harding's Manuscript Chronicle*.



“ was with him armed of Twenty Five Yere of Age ;  
 “ as I had been before at *Homyldon*, *Cokelawe*, and at di-  
 “ vers Rodes and Fields with him ; and knew his In-  
 “ tent, and had it wretyn. Wherefore I have titled in  
 “ this Book, that for Truth the Cause, why they rose  
 “ agenst him, may evermore be know. Their Quarrell  
 “ was so sweet, devout, and by good Advyle and Coun-  
 “ seill of Master *Richard Seroop*, Archbishop of York (for  
 “ whom G<sup>o</sup>d Almighty hath shewn many Miracles  
 “ sith that Time hitherward) and also by Counseill of  
 “ divers other Lords, that disteyned him, and were  
 “ bound to him by their Letters and Seals, which I  
 “ saw and had in kepying, while I was with him. And  
 “ all their Quarrell they sent unto King *Henry* in the  
 “ Field, wretyn under the Seales of their three Arms,  
 “ by *Thomas Knayton* and *Roger Salwayne* Squyers of Sir  
 “ *Henry Percy*, which Quarrell now followeth next after.

*These Arti-  
 cles are in La-  
 tin in the  
 MS. which I  
 have thought  
 fit to translate,  
 tho' they were  
 before printed  
 in Hall's  
 Chronicle, and  
 Grafton.*

“ WE *Henry Percy*, Earl of *Northumberland*, Constable  
 “ of *England*, and Warden of the West-Marches towards  
 “ *Scotland* ; *Henry Percy* our first born Son, Warden of  
 “ the East-Marches of *England* towards *Scotland*, and  
 “ *Thomas Percy* Earl of *Worcester*, Procurators and Pro-  
 “ tectors of the Commonwealth before our LORD JESUS  
 “ CHRIST our Supreme Judge ; Do say and affirm,  
 “ and intend to prove personally with our Hands on this  
 “ instant Day against thee *Henry Duke of Lancastre*, toge-  
 “ ther with thy Accomplices and Followers, unjustly cal-  
 “ ling thyself King of *England*, without a Title of Right,  
 “ but only by the Treachery and Violence of thy Party :  
 “ That when thou after thy Banishment didst enter *Eng-  
 “ land*, and camest to *Doncastre*, thou didst then swear to  
 “ us upon the Holy Gospels, then by thee touched and  
 “ kissed, that thou wouldest in no wise claim the King-  
 “ dom or Royal State, but only thy own proper Inheri-  
 “ tance, and thy Wife's in *England* ; and that *Richard*,  
 “ who was then our Lord the King, should reign for the  
 “ Term of his Life, being directed by the good Advice  
 “ of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal : But thou didst  
 “ imprison thine and our King in the Tower of *London*,  
 “ until he resigned, through Fear of Death, his King-  
 “ doms of *England* and *France*, and renounced all his  
 “ Right in the foresaid Kingdoms, and other his Lord-  
 “ ships and Lands beyond the Seas. By Colour of which  
 Resigna-



‘ Resignation and Renunciation, by the Advice of thy  
 ‘ Adherents, and the publick Cry of the Common Peo-  
 ‘ ple, brought together to *Westminster* by thy Means,  
 ‘ and the Help of thy Accomplices, thou didst there  
 ‘ crown thyself King of the foresaid Kingdoms, and  
 ‘ didst cause all the Royal Castles and Lordships to be  
 ‘ seized into thy Hands. Wherefore thou art false and  
 ‘ perjur’d.

‘ Item, ‘ We say and affirm, and do intend to prove,  
 ‘ That whereas thou didst swear to us upon the Holy  
 ‘ Gospels, at the same Time and Place, that thou wouldst  
 ‘ never permit any Tenth to be levy’d of the Clergy,  
 ‘ nor Fifteenths of the Laity, nor any other Taxes to be  
 ‘ raised in the Kingdom of *England* (s) for the King’s Use,  
 ‘ whilst thou livedst, but by the Consent of the Three  
 ‘ Estates in Parliament; and this only upon a pressing  
 ‘ Occasion, for the Defence of the Realm, and not o-  
 ‘ therwise. Thou, on the contrary, in Contempt of thy  
 ‘ Oath so taken, hast caused to be levied very many  
 ‘ Tenth and Fifteenths, and other Impositions and  
 ‘ Taxes, as well of the Clergy and Laity, meerly through  
 ‘ a Dread they had of thy Royal Majesty. Wherefore  
 ‘ thou art false and perjur’d.

(s) Ad opus  
 Regium, i. e.  
 K. Richard’s  
 Use or Occa-  
 sions.

‘ Item, ‘ We say and affirm, and do intend to prove,  
 ‘ That whereas thou didst swear unto us upon the said  
 ‘ Gospels, at the same Time and Place, that our and thy  
 ‘ Lord, King *Richard*, should reign as long as he lived  
 ‘ in the Enjoyment of his Royal Prerogatives; thou  
 ‘ didst cause our and thy Lord King *Richard*, traiterously  
 ‘ in thy Castle of *Pontfract*, without the Consent or  
 ‘ Judgment of the Lords in the Kingdom, for fifteen  
 ‘ Days and Nights (a Wickedness not to be heard by  
 ‘ Christians without Horror) to remain in Hunger, and  
 ‘ Thirst, and Cold; and thereby didst kill and murder  
 ‘ him. Wherefore thou art false and perjur’d.

‘ Item, ‘ We say and affirm, and do intend to prove,  
 ‘ That thou at that Time, when *Richard* our and thy  
 ‘ King was so put to Death in that horrible manner, as  
 ‘ is before related; thou didst seize and usurp the King-  
 ‘ dom of *England*, with the Name and Honour of the  
 ‘ Kingdom of *France*, contrary to thy Oath; from *Ed-  
 ‘ mund Mortimer*, Earl of *March*, the then next and di-  
 ‘ rect Heir of *England* and *France*; who Immediately and  
 Heredi-



‘ Hereditarily after the Decease of King *Richard*, ought to  
 ‘ have succeeded. Wherefore thou art false and per-  
 ‘ jured.

*Item*, ‘ We say and affirm, and do intend to prove, as  
 ‘ above; That whereas thou didst swear at the same  
 ‘ Place and Time, to support and maintain the Laws  
 ‘ and good Customs of the Kingdom of *England*; and  
 ‘ afterwards, at the Time of thy Coronation, didst again  
 ‘ swear to keep and preserve them inviolably; thou  
 ‘ treacherously and against the Law of *England*, didst  
 ‘ write to thy Fautors in every County in *England*, to  
 ‘ choose such Knights for each Parliament, as should be  
 ‘ agreeable to thy Pleasure: So that in those thy Par-  
 ‘ liaments no Justice could be obtain’d against thy Will,  
 ‘ upon any Complaints; altho’ we had very often peti-  
 ‘ tioned thee, according to the Consciences GOD had  
 ‘ given us; for the Truth of which we call GOD to wit-  
 ‘ ness, and the venerable Fathers *Thomas Arundell* Arch-  
 ‘ bishop of *Canterbury*, and *Richard Scrope* Archbishop of  
 ‘ *York*. Wherefore it behoves us to seek for Remedy, be-  
 ‘ fore our LORD JESUS CHRIST, by a strong Hand.

*Item*, ‘ We say and affirm, and do intend to prove,  
 ‘ That whereas *Edmund Mortimer* was taken by *Owen*  
 ‘ *Glendor* in mortal Fight, and cruelly by him held in  
 ‘ Prison and Iron Chains, in thy Cause; whom thou  
 ‘ didst proclaim to be taken treacherously, and would’st  
 ‘ not suffer him to be ransom’d, either by thyself, or by  
 ‘ us his (t) Kinsmen, and Friends; whereupon we have  
 ‘ lately treated with the said *Owen* for his Redemption,  
 ‘ at our own proper Cost, and for the Benefit of Peace be-  
 ‘ tween thee and him; upon which Account thou didst  
 ‘ consider us as Traitors; and for the future didst secretly  
 ‘ contrive our Ruin and final Destruction.

(t) *The Lord*  
*Henry Per-*  
*cy, called*  
*Hotspur,*  
*married the*  
*Sister of*  
*Roger Mor-*  
*timer Earl*  
*of March.*

‘ FOR these Reasons we do mortally defy thee, and  
 ‘ thy Accomplices, and Adherents, as Traitors, and Sub-  
 ‘ verters of the Commonwealth, and Kingdom; and In-  
 ‘ vaders, Oppressors, and Usurpers of the Rights of the  
 ‘ true, and direct Heir of *England*, and *France*; and we  
 ‘ intend to prove it this Day by the Force of our Arms,  
 ‘ Almighty GOD affording us his Assistance.

‘ TO these Articles *John Harding* immediately sub-  
 ‘ joins the following Lines.

FOR-



FORASMUCH as many Men have been inerrred, and yet stonde in grete Erroure and Contraverfy; holding Opinion froward, how that *Edmonde* Erle of *Lancastre*, *Leicestre*, and *Derby*, was the elder Son of Kyng *Henry III.* croukebacked, unable to have been Kyng, for the which, *Edward* his younger Brother was made Kyng by his Assent, as some Men have alleged, by an untrew Chronicle feyned in the Time of Kyng *Richard II.* by *John* of Gaunt Duke of *Lancastre*, to make *Henry* his Son Kyng, when he saw he might not be chole for Heire appariant to Kyng *Richard*.

So it is, that I *John Harding*, the Maker of this Booke, herde the Erle of *Northumberland*, that was slain at *Bramham-Moor*, in the Time of Kyng *Henry IV.* saie, how the same Kyng *Henry*, upon St. *Mathew* Daie, afore he was made Kyng, put forth that same Chronicle, claiming his Title to the Crown by the seid *Edmonde*, upon which all the Chronicles of *Westmynstre*, and of all other notable Monasteries, were had in the Council of *Westminstre*, and examined among the Lords, and proved well by all their Chronicles, that the Kyng *Edward* was the elder Brother, and the seid *Edmonde* the younger Brother, and not Croukebacked, nother maymed, but the seemliest Person of *England*, except his Brother *Edward*. Wherefore that Chronicle, which Kyng *Henry* so put forth, was adnulled and reprovod.

See also John  
Hardyng's  
printed Chronicle,  
c. 157

AND then I herde the seid Erle saie, that the seid Kyng *Henry* made Kyng *Richard*, under Duresse of Prison, in the Toure of *London*, in fere of his Life, to make a Renunciation of his Right to him; and upon that a Renunciation of his seid Right; and they were declared in the Counsell: And in the Parliament at *Westmynstre*, on the Morrow of St. *Michael* then next following, what of his Might and his Wilfulnesse, and what by certain Lords and Strength of the Commons, he was crowned against his Oath made in the *White Freers* at *Doncastre*, to the seid Erle of *Northumberland*, and other Lords, against the Will and Counsell of the seid Erle, and of his Son, and of Sir *Thomas Percy* Erle of *Worcester*. For which Cause they died after, as I knew well; for that time I was in the Field at *Shrewsbury* with Sir *Henry Percy*, of the Age of Twenty Five Yere, armed, and afore brought up in his House, of Twelve Yere Age.



‘ALSO I herde the seid Erle of *Northumberland* saie  
‘divers times, that he herde Duke *John* of *Lancastre*, a-  
‘mong the Lords in Counsell, and in Parliaments, and  
‘in the Common-House among the Knights chosyn for  
‘the Commons, aske by Bill, for to have been admytted  
‘Heire apparaunte to Kyng *Richard*, confideryng how  
‘the Kyng was like to have no Issue of his Body. To  
‘the which the Lords Spirituell and Temporell, and the  
‘Commons in the Common-House, by whole Advyse  
‘seide, that the Erle of *Marche*, *Roger Mortimere*, was  
‘his next Heire to the Crown, of full Descent of Blood,  
‘and they wolde have none other; and asked a Que-  
‘stion upon it, who durst disable the Kyng of Issue, he  
‘being young, and able to have Children? For which,  
‘when the Duke of *Lancastre* was so put by, he and  
‘his Counsell feyned, and forged the feyde Chronycle,  
‘that *Edmonde* should be the elder Brother, to make his  
‘Son *Henry* a Title to the Crowne; and wold have had  
‘the seide Erle of *Northumberland*, and Sir *Thomas Percy*  
‘his Brother of Counsaile thereof, for cause they were  
‘descendyd of the seid *Edmonde* by a Sister; but they  
‘refused it.

‘WHICH Chronycle so forged, the Duke did put in  
‘divers Abbaies, and in Freers, as I herde the seid  
‘Erle ofttimes saie, and record to divers Persons, for  
‘to be kept for the Inheritance of his Son to the  
‘Crowne; which Title he put furthe after he had Kynge  
‘*Richard* in the Toure; but that Title the Erle *Percy* put  
‘aside.”

UPON the Perusal of the foregoing Transcript, I  
persuade myself, the Reader will be thoroughly con-  
vinced, *First*, That the Doctor is much mistaken, when  
he tells us, that the Family of the *Percys* did not take  
up Arms for the Sake of the Right Heir; since the above-  
written Articles abundantly shew, that they had the In-  
terest of the (u) Earl of *March* entirely at Heart; and  
were chiefly animated to that hazardous Enterprize by a

(u) This is likewise evident from the  
Rolls of Parliament, where it is said, the  
Earl of Northumberland declared to the  
Ambassadors of the French King, Que a  
l'aide de Dieu, de le votre, & de plu-  
sours mes Allies, j'ay intention & ferme  
purpos de sustenir le droit querele de

monSouveraine Seigneur le Roy Richard,  
s'il est Vif; & si mort est, de vanger sa  
mort, & aussi de sustenir la droite que-  
relle, &c. Here the Copy of the Record,  
I made use of, breaks off; but it cannot be  
doubted, but the Earl of March was meant.  
Plac. Coron. 7 Hen. 4. N. 9.



Sense of the Injury done to him, and a full Conviction, that it became them to venture every thing, in order to procure him Justice. *Secondly*, It is from hence evident, that they charge *Henry IV.* with a Breach of his solemn Oath to them, by which he had obliged himself never to attempt any thing against the Right, Honour, or Safety of King *Richard*; upon Confidence of his due Performance of which Oath, they came to his Assistance. So that here is an *Original Contract* pleaded, by the Violation of which, on the King's part, the Earl of *Northumberland* and his Family thought themselves entirely released from all manner of Obligations to him. They declare, it was never their Intention to deprive *Richard II.* of his Crown; but that on the contrary, it was their constant Resolution, to maintain him in the Throne, and after his Decease to assert the Title of the True Heir: That *Henry* therefore was guilty of Perjury by usurping the Crown, and therefore forfeited all manner of Right to their Service. Out of a Sense of this their Duty to King *Richard*, and the Earl of *March*, they opposed, as far as they were then able, the Duke of *Lancastre's* Coronation; but (x) finding themselves incapable of making any effectual Resistance, it must be acknowledged, they submitted with the rest, and liv'd some Years in Obedience to him, as their King; and if the Doctor will have it so, swore to him too. But if this was an unjust Oath; if they themselves thought it so, when they took it, (as is evident from the Articles before-mentioned) will the Doctor blame them for not keeping it? He will say perhaps, they were inexcusable then in taking it; if they knew it to be an unrighteous Oath: I cannot help that; neither will it be worth the Doctor's while to insist upon it; since the main Point in Controversy now between us is, Whether they may be justified for taking up Arms against *Henry IV*?

(\*) John Harding's Chron. c. 196. The Percys had disbanded their Forces, supposing the Duke of Lancastre would keep his Word.

HOWEVER, that I may omit nothing, which may be serviceable for the Defence of that noble Family; I desire Leave to put him in mind of a certain Principle, generally received in the Times we are speaking of, and which for some while before had a very prevailing Influence over the great Men of this Kingdom, whenever they found themselves in Danger; and that was, that all Actions done through Fear of Death, were pardonable



at least, if not lawful. And it cannot be denied, but our Courts of Justice had been so favourable to Pleas of that Nature; before Henry IV.'s Reign; that great Encouragement had been given for the frequent Use of them. After the Battle of *Evesham*, when that famous (y) Act was made for the Settlement of the Kingdom, called *Dictum de Kenilworth*; those that had been drawn in to assist the Barons against the King through Fear, had but a small Fine set upon them. And in (z) *Edward III.*'s Reign, when *Walter de Alington* and his Confederates had forced some Persons, and made them swear to defend the Prizes they had taken; the Court admitted these Persons to bail, and dismissed them soon after. But the most remarkable Instance to this Purpose happen'd in the Beginning of this very Reign, which is now under our Consideration; for when the Judges, who had given illegal Advice to *Richard II.*, and thereby were the Occasion of some (a) Acts, that passed in the Twenty First Year of his Reign; when they, I say, were called to account for it in *Henry IV.*'s Parliament; they made use of this Excuse, That whatever they did, was for Fear of Death. Upon which the Commons presented this memorable Petition: (b)

*Item*, 'Your Commons pray, that neither the Lords Spiritual or Temporal, nor the Justices, may be allowed for the future to excuse themselves, by saying, they did not dare to act or speak according to Law, and as their true Meaning was, for Fear of Death, or because they were not free of themselves; for they are obliged to keep their Oaths, notwithstanding any Danger of Death or Forfeiture.

FROM whence I think it is plain, that this had been the common Argument made use of by the great Men, in Defence of their Illegal and Disloyal Practices; and

(y) 49 Hen. 3.

(z) 21 Edw. 3. Coram Rege Rot. 101. Linc.

(a) Coke's *Instit.* 1. 3. c. 2.

(b) Rot. Parl. 1. Hen. 4. 97. Item, Que les Seigneurs Esprituels & Temporels, ne les Justices, ne soient resceux en temps advenir pur leur excuser a dire, qu'ils n'oserent faire ne dire le ley, ne leur entent, pur doute de Mort, ou qu'ils ne sont libres de eux-mesmes. Pur ceo qu'ils sont puis tenuz de reson de gar-

der leur serments, que de douter Mort ou ascun forfaiture.

*The King answers.* Le Roy tient toutz les Seigneurs & Justices pur hommes sufficients & loyaux, qu'ils ne luy veillent donner autre Conseil n'advis, qui ne soit honeste, & joust, & profitable pur luy & le Royalmé; & si nully se voet compleindre en especial en temps advenir del contray, le Roy le fera re-fournier & amender.



Custom had so far prevail'd, that hitherto it had the good Fortune to be thought just and reasonable ; I may say too, that it continued in the same Credit in the following Reigns, notwithstanding this Petition of the Commons: For as *Henry IV.* in his Answer to it, says nothing, which implies a Disapprobation of that customary Excuse ; so we find, that in *Henry V.*'s Time, those that had assisted Sir *John Oldcastle* (c) only out of Fear of Death, were discharged : And lastly, by this Plea, *John* <sup>(c) Coke's  
Inst. 3. c. 1.</sup> *Nevill*, Marquis of *Montacute*, procured his Pardon from *Henry VI.* at his Restoration, for being in the Service of *Edward IV.* ; for it is said, (d) he came to his Parliament excusing himself, that for Fear of Death he had taken King <sup>(d) Holinf-  
head's Chron.  
p. 678.</sup> *Edward's* Part ; which Excuse was accepted. Agreeably therefore with the allowed and approved Maxims of those Times, the Submission and Oath of the *Percys* to *Henry IV.* has a fair Pretence to a favourable Construction ; since it was done purely to save their Lives and Fortunes, which otherwise must have been in imminent Danger. And this I would not be thought to mention, out of any great Reverence or Esteem I have for such an Apology ; but only to shew, that those Gentlemen did not act dishonourably, according to the Sentiments of the Times they liv'd in, when they took an Oath to *Henry IV.* which at that very Instant, they believed they ought not to keep. This was the common Error of that Age, into which, we have observed, the very Sages of the Law themselves had fallen ; and therefore it is not to be wonder'd at, if Noblemen (who rarely meet with Casuists, that advise them against their Interest) have not more Wisdom or Honesty, than they that make those Vertues more particularly their Profession. Had they liv'd in these Days of Light and Knowledge, I confess, I should have found it difficult, to say any thing in their Defence ; for the Doctrines of Christianity are now so well understood, that whoever should venture to maintain the Lawfulness of doing Evil for the Advancement of any Temporal End or Purpose, would draw upon himself at least the Displeasure of all good Men, and hardly escape a publick Censure.

AFTER all, it may perhaps give Offence to the Doctor, that I have charged *Henry IV.* with a Breach of his *Original Contract* ; and admitted that as a good Reason for



the *Percys* Taking up Arms against him : But surely, if there is any ground for the Notion of a Contract between a Prince and his Subjects; it must be, when an Elected King is on the Throne, who owes that high Dignity entirely to the Choice of the Nobility, and the Consent of the People; and (e) such a one, and no better, was this King *Henry*, whatever may be alledged to the contrary. He could not certainly pretend to a juster Title, than his Predecessor King *Stephen*; who yet consented to an Instrument of Government, in which he expressly calls himself an Elected King; and therefore the Historians tell us, that (f) *Robert* Earl of *Gloucester*, and the Bishops too, did Homage to him conditionally, that he would maintain them in their Rights and Privileges; and we know very well, that his Violation of them was pretended as a Reason for their Revolt from him afterwards.

SINCE therefore the Assistance given to *Henry* IV. by the *Percys* (by Virtue of which he was enabled to seize the Crown) was purely the Effect of that Confidence they reposed in his Promise and Oath, that he would never dethrone King *Richard*, nor put him to Death; I would submit it to the Doctor's Consideration, whether a Trust so notoriously broken and abused, did not authorize those Gentlemen to seek for Justice by Arms and Violence against him. That *Henry* IV. heaped great Honours upon the Earl of *Northumberland*, giving him the *Isle of Man*, and constituting him Constable of *England*, I very readily own; and this he certainly did, that he might the better secure that Great Family to his Interest: But then I think this is a Proof, that they were not influenced by any Motives of Advantage to themselves by their subsequent Revolt, (as the Doctor calls it) for how prosperous soever the Event had been, they could not well have promised themselves greater Accessions to their (g) Honours and Fortunes, than they either actually enjoyed, or might reasonably have hoped for from the Bounty and Favour of King *Henry*.

THUS far I will presume to say, I have clearly proved, that the Insurrections against *Henry* IV. were oc-

(e) J. Harding's *Chron.* c. 196.

(f) W. Malmesbury.

(g) Besides the Honours before-mentioned, all the Lands of the Douglasses in Scotland were granted to the Earl of Nor-

thumberland. Rymer's *Fœdera*, Tom. 8. p. 289. And many other great Estates, Sir W. Dugdale's *Baronage* in *Percy* Earl of *Northumberland*.



caſioned by a Profeſſion of Fidelity to the Rightful Title; to *Richard II.* whiſt alive, and the Earl of *March* after that King's Deceafe; and therefore the Authors and Promoters of them are much wrong'd by the Doctor; when he ſays, they acted upon quite different Motives.

THE next Commotions that happen'd in this Reign; were thoſe of Archbiſhop *Scroop*, and the Earl of *Northumberland*; and that theſe were raiſed upon the ſame Grounds, their publick Declarations ſufficiently teſtify. The Archbiſhop's Articles are (*b*) extant; in the Preamble of which he ſays, in his own Name, and that of all his Adherents, *That having been bound by their Oaths to King Richard II. to bear Faith and true Allegiance to him, as long as he lived, and his Heirs ſucceeding him by juſt Title, &c.* They therefore, for fear of Perjury, perceiving divers horrible Crimes and great Enormities to be daily committed againſt the Church, the Laws of the Realm, as alſo againſt the Perſon of King *Richard*, and his Heirs; do, *Fiſt*, declare the Lord *Henry* of *Derby* to be a Traitor to King *Richard* and his Heirs. *Secondly*, They pronounce him Perjur'd and Excommunicate, for taking Arms againſt King *Richard*, and afterwards murdering him. In the *Tenth* Article they affirm, that they take up Arms for the ſake of the Right Heir. Beſides *J. Harding* tells us, That the Lord *Percy's* Articles before recited, were drawn up by this Archbiſhop; and another (*i*) Author, that liv'd at the ſame Time, aſſures us, That the Reaſons, for which that Archbiſhop was beheaded, were, *Fiſt*, Becauſe he adviſed *Henry IV.* to repent of his Perjury in ſwearing by the Sacrament of CHRIST's Body, that he would not rebell againſt *Richard II.* nor conſent to his Depoſition; which afterwards he did. And, *Secondly*, The ſaid Archbiſhop deſired the Crown might be reſtored to the Right Line. Is it not then evident, beyond all Contradiſtion, that this Archbiſhop took up Arms for the Right Heir; and by his publick Declarations own'd to the World, that he thought himſelf bound in Honour and Conſcience ſo to do? And may we not then have liberty to believe,

(*b*) In *Fox's Acts and Monuments*, p. 591. and *Mr. Wharton's Anglia Sacra*, Vol. 2. p. 368.

(*i*) *Clement Maydſtone de Martyrio Archiepiſcopi Scrope*, in *Mr. Wharton's Anglia Sacra*, Vol. 2.



that He and the Percys were true (k) Penitents, for having contributed to the Settlement of *Henry IV.* upon the Throne? The Doctor indeed seems to laugh at this Conceit of their Repentance, as a groundless Fancy; and is (l) confident, that Men that acted upon such Motives, as the Earl of *Northumberland*, his Son *Hotspur*, and his Brother the Earl of *Worcester*, ought not to be esteemed Penitents: But I have proved, that the Doctor has shew'd himself a perfect Stranger to this Part of History; otherwise he must have known, that the true Cause of their Quarrel against *Henry IV.* was, that he was an *Usurper*; and they believed it to be their Duty, to place the *Rightful Heir* on the Throne.

It is a great Comfort to him however, that all these Lords and Gentlemen, who took up Arms against *Henry IV.* had before submitted to him, and sworn Allegiance; for he is only concerned to know, whether it has not been always the Custom, to swear to Kings *de Facto*: But if it has been the Custom to take such Oaths, he should remember, that it has been also the Custom to break them; which the Doctor knows to have happened in the Reigns of King *Stephen*, and *Henry IV.* the two most undoubted Kings *de Facto* from the *Norman Conquest*; and thus we are reduced at length to this Question, Whether the Doctor, or the chief Leaders in all the Insurrections against *Henry IV.* are rather to be credited? If we must believe the Doctor, their Revolt was inexcusable, founded upon no rational Principles, and indeed was no better than downright Perjury and Rebellion: But if we may take the Word, the dying Word of those Gentlemen; they were persuaded, that the Oath they had taken to *Henry IV.* did not bind them; and that they were obliged in Conscience to force him from the Throne, for the sake of the Right Heir.

(k) Holinhead, in his *Chron.* p. 529. gives Richard Scroop, Archbishop of York, the following Character. The Respect Men had to him, caused them to like better of his Cause; since the Gravity of his Age, his Integrity of Life, and incomparable Learning, with the reverend Aspect of his amiable Personage, moved all Men to have him in no small Estimation. Upon which account his Memory was held in such Esteem, that he was considered as a Saint and Martyr by the People, who frequented the Place of his Burial with great

Devotion, till they were restrained by Publick Authority, (Holinhead, p. 530.) And therefore *Henry V.* upon his Accession to the Crown, thought it a popular thing, to give Leave to the People to pay their accustomed Honours to this Archbishop's Memory, as J. Harding assures us, *Chron.* 211. He gave Leave then of good Devotion all Men to offer to Bishop Scrope expresse, without Letting, or any Question.

(l) *Defence*, p. 46.



Now the Doctor may call these unrighteous, and unjust Pretences, as long as he pleases; provided he will but allow, that it is true in Fact, that they made use of such, and no other; which I am confident he will never be able to disprove. And then I think I may appeal to the most byass'd Friend to the Doctor's Cause, Whether so many Gentlemen of the first Quality and Fortune in *England*, could openly and avowedly have ventured their Lives for a Person out of Possession; had it been then a known and undoubted Part of the Constitution, that whoever was in Possession of the Crown, was a Rightful and Lawful King. Had this been the received Doctrine of those Times, it is wonderful strange, we should meet with no manner of Notice of it in any of our Histories; it seems incredible, that so many Persons of Eminency should presume to act in open Contempt of it, to the manifest Subversion of a Fundamental Law of their Country; and yet without the least Reproach from their Enemies upon that account.

BUT I should remember, that these so often repeated Reflexions must needs be tiresome; and therefore it is fit I should hasten to another Subject. I would now only beg Leave of my Reader, to set before him a short View of the Comforts and Blessings, which attended the Doctor's *Constitution*, in this Reign of a King *de Facto*. Henry IV. had no sooner taken Possession of the Kingdom, but he was in Danger of losing it by a formidable Conspiracy, fram'd against him in the Heart of his Kingdom: It is true, he had the good Fortune speedily to suppress it, and make an Example of its Authors and Contrivers: But fresh Troubles and Rebellions (as the Doctor calls them) still followed one another for many Years of his Reign; and that evil Spirit of Resistance continued to animate the *Welsh* against him, to the last Period of his Life. Mr. Fox (*m*) tells us, *The Time of his Reign was far from being quiet, but full of Trouble, of Blood, and Misery.* (*m*) *Acts and Mon.* Vol. I. p. 590.

SUCH was their Desire of King *Richard* again, in the Reign of this King, that many Years after, he was rumour'd to be alive; for the which divers were executed. For the Space of Six or Seven Years together, almost no Year passed, without some Conspiracy against



(n) Chron.  
P. 541.

the King, &c. And (n) *Holinshed* confesses, he resign'd in great Perplexity, and little Pleasure. These certainly are admirable Proofs of the great Submission and Obedience, which was then paid to the Doctor's *Constitution*; and no doubt, the *Tranquillity* of this King's Reign will never be denied for the future, to be a lively Instance of the Authority of a King *de Facto*.

(o) In his  
Preface before  
his History of  
the World.

I SHALL now conclude these Remarks upon *Henry IV.*'s Reign, with the following Reflexion of that very judicious Gentleman *Sir Walter Raleigh*. (o)

*HENRY IV.*, whose Title was weak, and his obtaining the Crown traiterous; who brake Faith with the Lords at his Landing, protesting to intend only the Recovery of his proper Inheritance; brake Faith with Richard himself; and brake Faith with all the Kingdom in Parliament; to whom he swore, that the Deposed King should live: After he had enjoyed this Realm some few Years; and in that Time had been set upon on all Sides by his Subjects, and never free from Conspiracies and Rebellions; he saw (if Souls immortal see, and discern any Things after the Body's Death) his Grandchild *Hen. VI.*, and his Son the Prince, suddenly, and without any Mercy, murder'd: The Possession of the Crown (for which he had caused so much Blood to be poured out) transferr'd from his Race, and by the Issues of his Enemies worn and enjoy'd: Enemies, whom by his own Practice he supposed, that he had left no less powerless, than the Succession of the Kingdom questionless, by entailing the same on his own Issues by Parliament. And out of Doubt, Humane Reason could have judged no otherwise, but that these cautious Provisions of the Father, seconded by the Valour and signal Victories of his Son *Henry V.*, had buried the Hopes of every Competitor, under the Despair of all Re-conquest and Recovery. I say, that Humane Reason might so have judged, were not this Passage of *Casaubon* also true; A Day, an Hour, a Moment is enough to overturn the Things, that seem to have been founded and rooted in Adamant.

(p) Defence,  
P. 47.48.91.

I PROCEED now to *Henry V.*'s Reign, to whom, the Doctor is positive, the whole Kingdom, without Exception, submitted: The (p) *Earl of March* himself quietly resigning up his Right to the Crown, without making the least Attempt for the Recovery of it. But the Doctor should have known, that the *Welsh* were not brought under this King's Obedience in the Third Year of his Reign; whose original



nal Quarrel against him was upon the account of his Title, as I have shewn at large. And we are sure likewise, from (q) unquestionable Authority, that the Earl of *March* was engaged in a Conspiracy in this Reign, in order to Depose King *Henry*, and set the Crown upon his own Head: That for this Purpose he had agreed with his Brother-in-Law the Earl of *Cambridge*, to go with him into *Wales*; where they intended to proclaim Harry of *Lancastre Usurper of England*. And the Earl of *Cambridge* declares, that the Earl of *March* had told him, that all his Confessors put him in Penance to claim that, they called his Right. Besides, we find this said Earl (r) pardoned by *Henry V.* for the Share he had in this Conspiracy; which undeniably proves, the Doctor has strain'd a Point in History, when he would persuade us, that Earl never laid any Claim to the Crown. Afterwards, 'tis true, he gave *Henry V.* all imaginable Assurances of his entire Submission; upon which he was immediately employed by that Prince in the highest Offices of Trust and Honour; and those he discharged with great Fidelity, to the Time of his Death; which happen'd in the Third Year of *Henry VI.* During that Space of Time, I mean the Remainder of the Earl of *March's* Life; after he had made this Submission; I agree with the Doctor, *Henry V.'s* Title had some Foundation: For to whomsoever the Rightful Heir shall think fit to swear Allegiance, and perform the Services of a dutiful Subject, I shall make no Question, but every private and inferiour Person may very lawfully do the same. And this I take likewise to have been the Case of the People of *England*, for almost the whole Reign of *Henry VI.* For the Duke of *York* (who had the best Pretension by Blood to the Crown) having bound himself by repeated Oaths and Obligations, to pay Obedience to him, as his Lawful Prince; Who could reasonably be a *Nonjuror*, after such an Example? In this respect therefore the Doctor must do me the Justice to acknowledge, I yield him up a Point, which he seems to have very much at Heart. I allow it to be true, that *Richard Duke of York*, and his Son (afterward King *Edward IV.*) were under the strictest Ties and Engagements of Fidelity to *Henry VI.*; these are Matters of Fact too evident to be contested; and I am entirely satisfied, they may be

(q) See the Earl of Cambridge's Confession, apud Rymer. Foedera, &c. Tom. 9. p. 300, 301.

(r) Rymer. Foedera, Tom. 9. p. 303.



(s) *The several Renunciations of Richard Duke of York and his Son, being particularly and fully argued by Sir John Fortescue in his MS. Defence of the House of Lancaster* (Bibl. Cotton. Otho B. 1.) it may not be amiss to give the Reader a full View of them in the Appendix, N. I.

be proved (s) beyond all Possibility of Contradiction. But then the Doctor must confess, that *Henry V. and VI.* were Kings *de Jure*, as well as *de Facto*; i. e. they had a Right to the Subject's Allegiance by a different Title, than that of Possession; and consequently they are not Kings for the Doctor's Purpose; for the Question is not, whether Princes do not become Lawful by the Cession of the Legal Heir; this is granted, and allowed by his Adversaries; but whether the bare Possession of the Crown, exclusively of all other Considerations, can convey a Right to Allegiance? Thus we see the Doctor has given up Two of his Kings *de Facto*, which at other Times he seems to be very fond of, as main Supporters of his Imaginary Constitution.

\* See the whole Proceedings transcrib'd from the Parliament Rolls, App. N. 2.

BUT whatever the Doctor may lose in this Point, he doubts not to gain in another; for from hence he thinks it plain and undeniable, that *Edward IV.* and his Parliament were to blame in calling *Henry V.* and *VI.* Kings indeed, and not of Right; as if this was the first time this Distinction had been ever used, and it had never before been thought of: Whereas the Judgment given by the House of Peers in the \* Appeal of *Richard Duke of York*, was manifestly grounded upon it: For certainly they would never declare the Right of the latter to be indefeasible, had they believed *Henry VI.* to be King *de Jure*. But how could they think it reasonable, the Doctor will say, to give such a Sentence; considering the House of York had freely parted with their Right, by several solemn Oaths and Engagements? Could they not renounce their Pretensions to the Crown, if they had pleased? and was not this effectually done by their swearing Allegiance so often to *Henry VI.*? I answer; The House of Peers, to whose Arbitration this Matter was referred, was of another Mind; for after a full Hearing of all the Objections, that could be made against the Duke of York's Title, (among which his repeated Oaths of Homage and Fealty had been carefully and warmly urged) it was (t) concluded and agreed by all the Lords, *That the Title of the said Duke of York could not be defeated.* It is evident therefore, in the Opinion of that supreme Court of Judicature, That the Duke of York was still at liberty (notwithstanding the Oaths he had taken) to lay Claim to the Crown; and they thought themselves bound

(t) Rot. Parl. 39. Hen. 6. sect. 18.



in Justice to adjudge it to him. During the Time that the Duke of York, who had the Hereditary Right, kept his Oath, and paid Allegiance himself to King Henry, I see no Reason, why the Subjects of that Time might not Lawfully swear and perform Allegiance also: But when the said Duke claim'd the Crown as his Right of Inheritance; then it began to be a Question, Whether the Subjects were bound to pay Allegiance to the Lawful Heir, or to the King in Possession, to whom they had hitherto paid it. The first Article objected against the Doctor's Claim was, That the Lords should call to remembrance the Oaths they had made to King Henry; to which the Sum of the Duke's Answer was, *That no Oath ought to be performed, when it leadeth to the Suppression of Truth and Justice*; and he undertook to shew clearly, before any Judge spiritual, (u) *That the Lords were bound to assist him in Truth and Justice, notwithstanding any Oath of Feauté or other by him or them before made.*

(u) Rot.  
Parl. 39 Hen.  
6. n. 14.

THE Oaths of the Lords made to King Henry might be excusable, by their Ignorance of the Facts necessary to clear the Right of the Lawful Heir; by his not Claiming; and by his swearing Fealty to the King in Possession: But when the Claim was made publickly, and the Duke's Right to the Crown was evidently prov'd before the Lords; then it was plain, that their Oaths to King Henry being against evident Right, could not have any Obligation; for it was a known Rule in the spiritual Law, That (x) an Oath was not instituted to be a Bond of Iniquity: And in that very Age these Rules were inserted in the *Decretals*, (y) That an Oath, taken in prejudice of a superiour Right, was not valid; and that an Oath due to one, but made to another, was unlawful; and was to be performed to him, to whom it was due. Thus by the Canon Law the Oaths of the Lords were obligatory.

(x) Decr.  
2 Causa, 22  
Qu. 4. c. 22.

(y) Decre-  
tal. Greg. 9.  
lib. 2. tit. 24.  
c. 19, 22.

AND as to the Duke's Oath of Fealty to King Henry, according to the same Canon Law, then universally Receiv'd, and the common Opinion of Divines, He might be releas'd from it, if it was taken by him to preserve his Estate, Liberty, and Life. 'Tis in vain to make a Dispute about Force, or Duress. 'Tis Notorious from the State of that Time, that if the Duke had claim'd the



Crown, or borne the Royal Arms, or refus'd to swear Fealty to King *Henry*, he had expos'd himself and Family to inevitable Destruction: To that Objection he answereth thus himself, before the Lords; (z) *That he abstained for the Time from pursuing of his Right and Title, for Causes not unknown to all this Realm*: The Danger of doing it was Notorious to all Men. Wherefore (a) as his Silence was no Cession of his Right; because there was a sufficient Cause of Silence: So his Oath of Fealty was no indispensable Renunciation of it, according to the (b) received Law and Doctrine of those Times; because it was extorted by unjust Terror, and made by him *pro vitâ & rebus servandis*. King *Henry* could acquire no Right by exacting it; because his Requiring of it was Injustice, and Usurpation: And as to the Duke, tho' he ought not to have taken it, to gain or save the World; yet when it was taken, the spiritual Law reliev'd him: And the Pope actually granted him a Dispensation, which was then thought a sufficient Absolution. I am far from allowing the Pope any Power of dispensing with Oaths, or justifying the easy Relaxation of them by corrupt Casuistry: But if we will judge of the Actions of Princes in Ages past, and examine the Validity of them, we must consider the Laws, Usages, and Doctrines then Receiv'd, and judge accordingly. Mankind in all Ages hath had an Horror of Violence, and Usurpation, as destructive of Society; and hath agreed to render the Effects of them null, and invalid. Not Princes only, but all other sorts of Men, have always thought themselves free from the Obligations of Promises and Oaths, attended with enormous Lesion, and extorted by Fear of losing Estate, Liberty, and Life; and (c) great Writers upon the Law of Nature do plainly affirm the Nullity of such Oaths. In short, if the Duke of *York's* Oath had then

(z) Rot. Parl. ibid. n. 16.

(a) Grotius de jure B. 1. 2. c. 4. sect. 6. Qui sciens & præsens tacet, videtur consentire, nisi circumstantiæ ostendant, quò minus loquatur, metu eum impediri.

(b) Dec. Greg. 9. l. 2. tit. 24. c. 15. Verùm in eâ Quæstione, an à Sacramenti vinculo absolvantur, qui istud inviti pro vitâ & rebus servandis fecerunt; nihil aliud arbitramur, quàm quod An-

tecessores nostri Rom. Pont. arbitrati fuisse noscuntur, qui tales à juramenti nexibus absolverunt. Cæterùm ut agatur consultiùs, & auferatur Materia dejerandi, non eis ita expressè dicatur, ut juramenta non servant: sed si non ea attenderint, non ob hoc sunt tanquam pro mortali crimine puniendi. Vide Thom. Aq. 2. 2<sup>æ</sup> Qu. 98. 3. 1<sup>m</sup>.

(c) Puffend. de jur. nat. lib. 4. c. 2. f. 8.



been try'd in any spiritual Court, as he desir'd it might be; he would no doubt have been acquitted of it. The high Court of Lords Spiritual and Temporal, his and their own Oaths notwithstanding, adjudg'd that his Title could not be defeated; and this was the general Opinion of the Nation in those Times, that the House of York had an indubitable Right; and the much greater Part of the Nation was for it, (as all our Historians agree) their Oaths to the House of *Lancaster* notwithstanding.

IF after all, the Doctor will persist to affirm, that *Richard* Duke of York and his Son, were indispensably obliged by their Oaths to *Henry VI.*, and could not possibly be discharged from them by any Authority in the Kingdom, or out: This may be true, and yet the Award of the Peers be consistent with the Rules of Justice and Equity; for they do not pretend to determine, what was fit for those Princes to do in Conscience; but what they were bound to by the Laws of their Country, of which they were the proper Judges; and therefore whoever arraigns their Proceedings in this respect, does in Effect set up his own Private Judgment, against the Publick Sense of the Nation; (d) *which in Modesty should be allowed to understand, what the Constitution was in their own Times, better than we can at this Distance; and in Charity we ought to believe, that they acted agreeably to it.* This I take to be the true State of the Case. The Duke might have still continued a Subject, had he thought fit; and would his Ambition have suffer'd him to be so contented in that Condition: But how could the Peers help it, if the Duke of York would not be satisfied without his Right? All that became them, was to consider impartially the Matter referred to them: And since at length they came to this Resolution, that he was still at Liberty to claim the Kingdom, and ought to be put in Possession of it; who will presume to say, it was Arbitrary and Illegal? If a private Subject swears to one, who has wrongfully disseized him of his Estate, that he will never attempt the Recovery of it; the Law will put him in Possession, if he applies to it, notwithstanding his Oath, which Religion perhaps would oblige him to perform. And thus it is in many other Cases. If a Man loses a Sum of Money at Play, beyond what the Act of Parliament allows; and obliges himself by Oath to pay it; this may  
be

(d) *Vicm,*  
P. 7.



be a just Debt in Conscience; tho' the Law will not force him to discharge it. In which Instance the Law does not pretend to annul his Oath; but only withdraws its Assistance from the Party, to whom it was made, as unworthy of any Aid or Countenance. And if the Law takes so much Care of the Rights of Private Persons, that they have not Power to alienate their Properties, by any Oaths or Conveyances, contrary to customary Methods, and prescribed Forms; certainly we are bound to believe, that the Titles of Princes and Heirs to the Crown, are at least as strongly guarded against any Injuries, which may be done them, even with their own Consent. So that the Judgment of the House of Lords in this Case seems plainly to rest upon this Bottom; That the Oaths taken by *Richard Duke of York*, did not amount to a Resignation; neither could that be Legally and Validly performed, without a due Observation of the Form and Manner, requisite to be observed upon such an Occasion.

It may now perhaps be demanded, how it is then possible for a Right Heir to the Crown to resign his Title, if the Oaths and Submissions of *Richard Duke of York*, were not sufficient for that Purpose. I answer, That a Legal and Effectual Resignation can only be made before, and with the Concurrence of the Three Estates of the Realm; which evidently appears from the Proceedings in this very Case of *Richard Duke of York*. For tho' the Lords would not allow, what he had done, upon any Consideration to be of Force to invalidate his Title; they were very sensible it was then in his Power to do it effectually, in the Presence, and with the Approbation of both Houses of Parliament. And therefore, tho' they had declared his Title could not be defeated by any Objections hitherto urged against it; yet they (e) thought it advisable for the Peace of the Kingdom, that he should consent, that *Henry VI.* should remain in the Throne for his Life; which being agreed to, and publickly ratified in open Parliament: Then, and then only, could *Richard Duke of York* be said to have made a sufficient and complete Resignation. And lest it should be suspected I have here deliver'd a singular Opinion, destitute of all manner of Authority; I hope the following Passage out of my Lord Chief Justice  
Hale's

(e) Rot.  
Parl. 39 H.  
VI. N. 18.



Hale's MS. *History of the Pleas of the Crown*, will acquit me in this Point.

(f) *A King, that by Consent of Parliament takes another in Consortium Imperii, remains a King within the 25th of Edward III. We never had any Instance thereof in this Kingdom, but in that of Henry II, who took his Son into a kind of subordinate Regality; so that there was Rex Pater, and Rex Filius. But it is to be observed, that Henry II. did not divest himself of the Sovereignty, as some have thought; but reserv'd to himself the Liege, Homage, and Allegiance of his Subjects, yea and of his Son also: And although his Son were a King, yet he was a King but subordinate to his Father; and therefore, although he might be in some respects a King, in relation to the Subjects, that their Conspiring his Death might be Treason; yet he was but a Subject in respect to his Father; and his Attempt to eject his Father from his Kingdom, was Treason.*

(f) *Sir Matthew Hale's Hist. Placit. Coronæ, MS. Cap. 9. Vol. I.*

But this Communication of Sovereignty by the King, could not be done without Consent of Parliament: For as a King cannot wholly resign, or dismiss himself of his Kingly Office, without Consent of Parliament; so neither could he, without such Consent, divide the Sovereignty. It was a wise Expression of Queen Elizabeth, when she was urged to marry; she reply'd, She was married to her Kingdom; there is a sacred Bond between the King and his Kingdom, that cannot be dissolved without the free and mutual Consent of both in Parliament.

In foreign Kingdoms there have been Instances of voluntary Cessions or Resignations, which possibly may be warranted by their several Constitutions; but by the Laws of England the King cannot resign his Sovereignty, without his free Consent, and the Consent of Parliament. The Resignations that were made by Edward II, and Richard II, were extorted by Force, Violence, and Oppression, to give a Countenance to those Usurpations, that succeeded them; and were Acts of high Disloyalty and Injustice, and not to be mention'd without Detestation.

It must be confessed, that my Lord Chief Justice speaks only of the Resignation of a King, not of the Right Heir, who is not in Possession; but surely the People of England have an Interest in the Right Heir, as well as in the King; and have been sworn to one, as well as the other; and therefore it behoves them to be



well assured, that Resignations made by such Heirs, are entirely free and voluntary ; which cannot be done to general Satisfaction, but in open Parliament. Besides, if Oaths should be allowed as sufficient to convey a Right to whom they are taken ; it could not be doubted, but Kings might part with their Crowns out of Parliament, as well as the Doctor believes the Duke of York did with his Hereditary Title. So that all things duly consider'd, I may venture to say, That no Kingdom of the World has declared itself more clearly and expressly in Favour of the Rightful Heir out of Possession, and consequently against the Authority of a King *de Facto*, than our own has done in the particular Case now before us: For here we find Judgment given against a Family, that had been in Possession of the Throne near Sixty Years ; that had been frequently and solemnly owned and recognized by the Submissions and Oaths of all the great Nobility, and even of those very Persons, who laid Claim afterwards to the Crown : From whence the Inference is very plain and obvious ; that by the Constitution of *England*, the Rightful Heir cannot destroy his Title by any Oaths of Homage or Allegiance ; but he is still at Liberty to revive his Claim, when he thinks convenient ; which can never be entirely extinguished, but by his free and express Renunciation in open Parliament.

The (g) Doctor says indeed, that this was a partial Declaration of the House of Lords ; King *Henry* being then a Prisoner, and the Duke of *York*, by a late Victory, absolute Master of the Parliament. But our present Dispute is about the Validity and Obligation of this Judgment ; not the Means, by which it was obtain'd ; which might be unrighteous and unjustifiable, and yet the Acts effected by them, of good Authority ; for otherwise *Magna Charta* itself must be rejected, as Null and Void ; since it was most certainly extorted by Arms and Violence. It is (h) enough to our Purpose, That this Judgment was given in a full House of Peers ; That King *Henry's* Friends were not only at Liberty, but were earnestly (i) desired by the Chancellor to object every thing, that might be proper for the Fortifying of his Title ; That this Judgment was the Foundation of the Agreement between *Henry VI.* and *Richard* Duke of *York*, which was assented to by both Houses, and confirmed

(g) *View*,  
P. 54.

(h) *Quampluribus Prælati & Proceribus præsentibus, Rot. Parl. 39 Hen. VI. N. 1.*  
(i) *Ibid.*



firmed by King *Henry* himself. And lastly, it ought to be considered, that this Judgment was never reversed or censured as Unjust or Illegal ; but has always been esteemed as a Rule for future Proceedings; if the like Case should ever happen. Some of our <sup>(k) Hall's Chron. and Holinshed from him.</sup> Chronicles, it is true, give us such a History of the Duke of *York's* Behaviour in this Parliament, that one would really think, that King *Henry* was a Prisoner, during the whole Session ; or never appeared, or had any thing to do in it ; for they tell us, that the Duke of *York* placed himself in the Royal Throne, at the Opening of the Parliament ; and made a long Speech to the Peers, with all the Air and Authority of a King ; but surely the Records are more safely to be rely'd upon, which represent Matters quite otherwise. There we find, that the Parliament began their Session in King *Henry's* Presence, who was seated in his Throne, in the Painted Chamber of his Palace at *Westminster*. And some Days after, the Claim of the Duke of *York* was presented to the Lord Chancellor, not by the Duke himself, (who is not mentioned, as appearing in the House, while the Debate continued) but by his Counsel ; who also returned an Answer to the Arguments urged in Favour of *Henry's* Title. So that those Stories of his Seating himself in the Throne, or Laying his Hand upon it, and then Claiming it Personally, are Fictions contrived purely for the Entertainment of those, that delight in secret History. All that I shall now add, is only this ; That by Virtue of this Judgment, *Edward* Earl of *March* claimed the Crown, upon the Duke of *York's* Decease ; and soon after obtained Possession of it ; and then his Father's Words were remarkably verified : <sup>(l) Rot. Parl. 39 Hen. VI. N. 16.</sup> *That though Right for a Time may rest, and be put to silence ; yet it rotteth not, nor shall not perish.*

I HAVE now finished my intended Examination of the Doctor's List of Kings *de Facto*, from the Conquest to *Richard III* ; and I persuade myself, have made it at least doubtful, whether most of them had not a better Title, than he is willing we should believe : However, I think I have proved, that the Obedience, which was paid to them, could not be the Effect of the Doctor's Principles. Surely, if there ever was Occasion for them, it was in this Case of King *Henry VI*, when his Friends were



were earnestly desired by him, to think of every thing, that might be proper to defend his Right against the Claim of *Richard Duke of York*: But among the several Arguments urged for his Defence, (now extant upon Record.) it is evident, the Doctor's weighty Reasons were either never thought of, or else were over-ruled; which could never easily have happen'd, had they then been looked upon as any Part of our Constitution, or even as consistent with it.

BEFORE I close this Chapter, I must intreat the Reader to observe, that among the Reasons assigned for paying Obedience to the (m) Doctor's Kings *de Facto*, I have not mentioned the Interposition of the *Pope's* Authority; which, as mean as he is pleased to think it then was, never failed to be employed in all publick Controversies in those Times; and was not a little consider'd. It were easy to prove this by many Instances; but at present I shall only desire the Doctor to remember, that those Princes, whom he has inserted into his List of Kings *de Facto*, took care in the first place, to fortify their Title by the *Pope's* Consent and Approbation; which could never have deserv'd the Pains they usually employed in procuring it; if it had not been of some Advantage to them, in the Opinion of their Subjects. *William the Conqueror* brought with him into *England* a Banner, that had receiv'd the *Pope's* Blessing; and he as well as his Sons, who succeeded him, as resolutely as they opposed the Papal Encroachments in several respects, were always desirous to maintain a good Correspondence with the Holy See. (n) King *Stephen* made it a Part of his Title, that he was confirmed by the *Pope* in his Kingdom; and I have already shewn, that the whole (o) Body of the Bishops swore Fealty to *Stephen* a second Time, in Obedience to the See of *Rome*; and not long after absolutely refused to crown *Eustachius*, *Stephen's* Son, purely by Virtue of an Order they had receiv'd from the *Pope*. What Regard was paid to the *Pope's* Authority in King *John's* Reign, the (p) Doctor seems to be sensible: And

(m) *Defence*, p. 25, &c.

(n) *Richardus Hagulstadenfis* (ad A. D. 1126.) says, the *Pope* not doubting, but that King *Stephen* had promised Obedience to him at his Coronation, grants

him a Bull, in which he confirms him in the Throne. Which Bull may there be seen, as also in *Rymer. Fœdera*, Tom. 1.

(o) *P.* 54.

(p) *Defence*, p. 26.



I beg leave to put him in mind, that the *French* Author, who wrote in Verse *An Account of the Troubles of Richard II.* of which he himself was a Witness, (*MS. Bibl. Harley, 68: c. 23. fol.*) says, *Archbishop Arundell procured a Bull from the Pope, which he openly read to the People, in which the Pope offered a Plenary Indulgence to all, that should assist the Duke of Lancastre against Richard II.* The Three *Henrys* of the House of *Lancastre* thought it no small Advantage to their Cause, that they had gain'd the *Popes* for their Friends. At last indeed his Holiness, by a strange piece of Ingratitude, is (q) said so far to have abandoned King *Henry VI.* as to have absolv'd *Richard Duke of York*, from all his Oaths to him; a Circumstance very worthy of the Doctor's Notice; because he expects from his Adversaries, that they should prove, *the Popes had ever put in Practice their pretended Power of absolving Subjects from their Allegiance,* (r). Lastly, the Devotion of *Henry VII.* to the See of *Rome*, and how much he depended upon the *Pope's* Confirmation of his Title, are Matters of Fact sufficiently known. In the Beginning of his Reign a Bull is dispatched into (s) *England*, in order to secure him on the Throne; which he thought of such Consequence, that the *Archbishop of Canterbury* was obliged to send his Mandates to all the Bishops, to enter the Contents of it in their Registers, of which a Copy will be found in the (t) *Appendix*, taken out of the Register of *Dr. Stillington Bishop of Bath and Wells*. In the (u) 13th Year of his Reign this Bull was renewed; and a fresh Confirmation of his Title granted by *Pope Alexander VI.* under Pain of Excommunication to such, as should, upon any Pretence whatsoever, disturb the Peace of the Nation, and create Troubles to his Government. And therefore all our Historians have taken care to assure us, that *Henry VII.* put a great deal of Confidence in these Bulls. The Truth is, none of our Princes have been so kind to *Popes*, as those that have had the weakest Titles; because they found it their Interest to purchase the Favour and Protection of the *Papal See* by large and unreasonable Grants and Concessions. Thus

(q) Holinhead's *Chronicle*, p. 642;  
850.

(r) *Defence*, p. 25.

(s) *Rymer. Fœd. Tom. 12. p. 297.*

(t) *Appen. N. 3.*

(u) *Dr. Brady's History of the Succession*, p. 391.



King Stephen, to gratify the Pope for his Indulgence in confirming his Title, suffers his Legate (x) to exercise a Degree of Authority in England, which was never before endured ; and (y) our Author tells us, that Appeals to Rome first took their Rise from his Reign. Henry IV. being under the same Necessity of courting the Pope's Assistance, to support him in his unjust Possession of the Throne ; was not wanting in his Compliments to him : Therefore in the Beginning of his Reign he procured himself a Power (z) to moderate or repeal the Statute of Provisors ; and the first Act of Parliament for burning of Hereticks, has been always thought to be the Effect of his Gratitude to the Holy See. Neither was Henry VII. less forward in dutiful Returns to his great Benefactor ; for my Lord Bacon says, (a) *He ever applied himself with much Respect to the See of Rome.* And it must be confessed, upon all those Interruptions of the Succession, the Church of Rome so well found her Account, that she never failed to encourage them, as the properest Occasions of making her Encroachments on the Crown ; and therefore in that respect, as well as in relation to the disadvantageous Bargains they were usually forced to make with Potent Peers, in order to engage them in their Interest ; Mr. Prynne had reason to make this Reflexion ; (b) *That Kings created, and set up meerly by Parliaments, and their own Power in them, without any True Hereditary Title, have seldom answered the Lords and Commons Expectations in the Preservation of their just Laws and Liberties, and Answers to their Petitions.* As a Proof of which, I shall only beg Leave to take Notice of one particular Instance, among the many of this Nature, which the Reigns of Henry IV. and VII. furnish us with. Those that are acquainted with the Histories of those Princes,

(x) *The Bishop of Winchester, as the Pope's Legate, had the Boldness to cite his Brother King Stephen before the Synod at Winchester, to answer for his Misbehaviour towards the Bishops, W. Malmsburiensis, Hist. Nov. l. 2. Et vide W. Malmsbur. de Gest. Pontif. In Radulpho Archiepiscopo, p. 131. l. 1.*

(y) Hen. Huntingdon, l. 8. p. 226. (16 Steph. R.) Totumque illud Concilium novis Appellationibus infrenduit. In Angliâ namque Appellationes in usu non erant, donec eas Henricus Winton.

dum Legatus esset, malo suo crudeliter intrusit. In eodem namque Concilio ad Rom. Pontif. audientiam ter appellatus est.

(z) Cotton's *Abridg. of Rec.* 1 Hen. IV. 86, & 2. Hen. IV. 26.

(a) *Life of Hen. VII.* p. 70. Engl. And see the *Year Books*, 1 Hen. VII. 10 Term. Hil.

(b) *Mr. Prynne's Preface to Sir Robert Cotton's Abridgment of the Records*, Sect. 14.



know very well, that *Henry IV.* had never any occasion to try his Fortune in Battle against King *Richard II.*; and therefore could not with Justice pretend to owe his Crown to his Sword; but indeed to the general Disgust; which the Subjects of that unfortunate (c) Prince had taken against him, which naturally produced a *Desertion*. However, he had the Confidence in open Parliament to pretend a Right to the *Isle of Man* by Conquest; and by Virtue thereof he gave it to the Earl of *Northumberland*. Whereas indeed the Conquest was no otherwise, than that Sir William Scroop was taken by him at *Bristow*, and beheaded by those, which were of the Part of this King, while he was Duke of *Lancastre*, and made his Way to the Crown. But it is not so much a Wonder, to see him give it as a Territory acquired by Conquest; if withal it be remember'd, that he had purposed to have challenged the Crowns of *England* and *Ireland* by a Title of the Sword, and not by Inheritance. But he was dissuaded from that Claim by Sir William Thirning, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas; and thence it was, that to give some Satisfaction to the Parliament, that doubted it, he made a publick Protestation, that he would not that any Man should think, that by way of Conquest he would (d) disinherit any Man of his Heritage, Franchise, or other Rights, &c. I have represented this Matter in (e) Mr. Selden's own Words, a Gentleman of unquestionable Authority; from whence it appear'd, how safe the Liberties of *England* were like to be in his Hands, after so early an Attempt against them. But *Henry VII.* had either more Resolution, or better Fortune; for tho' he ow'd his Success against King *Richard* to a Promise (f) he had made before he invaded the Kingdom, of marrying the Princess *Elizabeth*; yet he always made use of his Title by the Sword, and prefer'd it before all others: And the Truth is, it might be easily proved by some following Passages of his Reign, that he govern'd more like a Conqueror, than a Prince, that desired to be thought a Friend to the Constitution.

(c) Rot. Parl. i Hen. IV. Part 5. Memb. 36.

(d) Rot. Parl. i Hen. IV.

(e) Titles of Honour, c. 3. p. 25.

(f) Bacon's Life of Hen. VII. pag. 2. Ed. Eng. Fol.

THE Doctor having endeavoured to shew, that the Subjects always believ'd their *Allegiance* to be due to every Prince upon the Throne, without regard to Birth, or any previous Title; in the next place he undertakes to prove, that Kings *de Jure* themselves have freely declared



clared themselves of the same Opinion. This, I confess, is home to his Purpose; but let us observe, from whence the Doctor draws this Discovery. (g) He says, the Year-Books clearly shew, that upon the Death or Demise of any King of England, (by whose Authority, and in whose Name the Laws are administred) all Actions, Suits, &c. which were depending in any of the King's Courts, were discontinued, and the Parties put off; so that the Plaintiffs were compelled to begin their Actions again, or to sue a Re-summons to revive their Actions, until the 1st of Edward VI. chap. 7. provided a Remedy. Thus it was after the Death of Edward IV. in the Courts of Edward V. Thus in the Courts of Edw. IV. after the Dispossession of Hen. VI; and so it was likewise after the Death of Richard III, in the first Year of Henry VII. From which Instances the Doctor observes, that Edward IV.'s, and Henry VII.'s Judges allowing, that all the Actions and Suits depending in the Reigns of Hen. VI, and Richard III, were discontinued by their Death or Demise, they likewise acknowledged thereby the Authority of those two Kings, by which, and in whose Name the Laws had been administred in their respective Reigns. And the Doctor has thought fit in his late (h) Defence, to insist again upon this Argument, as much to his Purpose.

BUT he must pardon me, if I think this a strange and very unaccountable Way of Reasoning. For how can it be any Proof of the Authority of a King *de Facto*, when alive; because it ceases, when he is dead? My Lord Chief Justice Coke (whom the Doctor will give me Leave to think as able a Lawyer, as himself) has (i) given a plain Reason, why Discontinuance of Process and Law-Suits was unavoidable in those Times, upon the Death or Demise of every King; and that is, because all their Commissions expire with themselves; and consequently the Courts of Judicature were destitute of Judges to preside

(g) *Vier*, p. 9.

(h) P. 52.

(i) *Coke's Reports*, Part 7, 30. Al common Ley per demise le Roy le Plea fuit discontinue, & le Proces, que fuit agard & nient retourne devant le mort le Roy, fuit perde: Car per le Breve del Predecessour rien poit estre execute in le Temps del Novel Roy, si non que il soit in Special Cases; car par le mort le Roy

non seulement les Justices de l'un Banc & de l'autre, & Barons del Exchequer, mes les Viconts auxi & Eschetors, & routs Commissions de Oyer & Terminer, Gaole Delivery & Justices de Peace, sont determinees par le mort le Predecessour, qui eux fit; & pur le remede de ceo fuit le Statute de 1 Edw. VI. c. 7. mais encore cet Act n'adprovidie remede pur routs les Mischiefs, &c.



over them ; and proper Officers were wanting, upon whom the Execution of all Writs and Orders depends : So that the Doctor's Argument is plainly this ; *Henry VI.* had as little Power in some Cases, as his Predecessors ; therefore he had as much as they, in all other respects : Or thus ; *Henry VI.* could not raise Taxes without a Parliament, no more than King *Edward III.* ; therefore he was as Lawful a Prince as he. Surely one must have great Partiality for the Doctor, to approve of such Reasoning. Had the Case indeed been quite otherwise ; upon *Henry VI.*'s Demise ; had the Law-Courts been open, and Processess been continued ; it might truly then have been affirmed, that his Commissions had a greater Force and Virtue, than any of those of his Predecessors ; and this, I confess, might have been admitted as a Proof, that *Edward IV.* did really own his Authority : But as the Doctor has managed his Argument, it is evidently to the Disadvantage of his Cause ; for were it true, that he is a Lawful King, upon whose Death or Demise all Processess are discontinued in the Courts of Justice ; then it would be impossible there should be any Usurpers ; then *Oliver Cromwell* would have had a good Title, according to the old *English Constitution* ; and lastly, the Authority of the *Commonwealth* must also be allowed ; for all Processess, &c. begun in their Courts, would have been discontinued at the Restoration of King *Charles II.* if an Act of Parliament had not passed on purpose to prevent it. In a word, the (k) Doctor inferrs from the *Discontinuance of Actions, Suits, &c.* in the Courts of Law, at the Demise of *Henry VI.* and the Dispossession of *Edward IV.* ; that these two Kings mutually acknowledged one another's Authority. Now the Reader must needs think this a very strange Piece of News ; if he considers, that these Princes treated one another, upon all Occasions, with the opprobrious Names of *Usurpers* and *unjust Possessors* of the Throne : The Doctor knows this to be true of *Edward IV.* whose Acts are full of Reflexions on the Three *Henrys*, as Kings without any Right or Justice ; and when *Henry VI.* recovered the Crown, he (l) speaks of *Edward IV.* in the same civil

(k) *View*, p. 9.

(l) *Apud Rymer. Fæder. & Convent. &c.* Tom. xi. p. 705, 706. *Henry VI.* calls *Edward IV.* *Inimicum suum magnum*

& *Rebellem*, qui nuper *Coronam & Dignitatem nostras falsò & proditoriè, ac usurpativè occuparat.* Et vide p. 696, 680.



and obliging manner ; for he says, that he *falsly, traiterously, and usurpingly* possessed the Crown. Were they then but in jest, when they bestowed this Language so freely upon one another? And has the Doctor at last discovered a secret League of Friendship between them? It will however be very obliging in him, to make it out a little better, than he has yet vouchsafed to do.

(m) *View,*  
p. 13.

THE Doctor now proceeds to another Argument from the *Year-Books*. (m) *From them*, says he, *we may observe, that all the Grants, Licenses, Letters Patent, Gifts, and in short, all the Regal Acts of the Three Henrys of the House of Lancaster, and of Richard III, are pleaded and allowed in all the Judicial Proceedings of Edward IV, and Henry VII's Courts of Judicature, to be as valid, as if they had been the Grants, &c. of any of their Progenitors of the most uncontested Titles.* Bagot's Case is that, which has been usually urged and debated in this Controversy; and some may be apt to think, this is the only Instance, that is to be given; but in Truth the *Year-Books* furnish us with abundance of the like Cases. Bagot's Case alone was cited, I suppose, by my Lord Chief Justice Coke; not only because he thought that Case was of itself decisive; but because it was the only Case in the *Year-Books*, where the Authority of a King *de Facto* had ever been disputed, and yet Judgment given for it; and because several Points of Law relating to that Authority were there maintain'd.

IN answer to all this, I might justly question, whether in Fact it be true, that such an abundance of Instances can be produced of Grants, Licenses, &c. of the Three Henrys, which were pleaded and allowed in the Courts of Edward IV. For after a careful Perusal of the *Year-Books* of that Reign, I must freely own, that if any such are to be met with, they have escaped my Observation, tho' I used as much Diligence in order to the Discovery, as I thought was necessary. It is worth enquiring of the Doctor, within what Period of Time this abundance of Instances happen'd; for if they all preceded Bagot's Case, it is strange they did not prevent it; or that that Case should ever have troubled the Courts of Justice, had the Authority of Kings *de Facto* been held unquestionable. But after all, if some such Instance should be produced, I would intreat him to consider, whether those Grants of the Three Henrys, that should be found to be allowed in the Courts  
of



of Edward IV, did not owe their Validity entirely to the Confirmation of that King. For if this should prove to be the Case, I may then safely appeal to the most partial of his Friends, whether this Argument from the *Grants*, &c. of the Three *Henrys*, can do this Cause any Service. But it will be time enough to insist upon this, when the Doctor's Instances are brought to Light.

As for the *Grants*, &c. of *Richard III*, which, he is pleased to affirm, were likewise admitted as valid in several Instances by *Henry VII*'s Judges; I must beg Leave to think this another Mistake of the Doctor's; because I have not been so fortunate, as to meet with any such in my Search: However I am persuaded, they will not turn to his Account, should they ever appear; for Reasons, which shall be given in their proper Place.

I AM now arrived at that famous Case, which the Doctor calls *Decisive*; and believes to be an indisputable Proof, that the Law of *England* ascribes a full and complete Authority to Kings *de Facto*, by allowing all their Grants and Regal Acts to be valid and effectual to all Intents and Purposes. I shall beg the Liberty therefore to lay it before the Reader in a more exact and ample Manner, than I think has been hitherto done; some Circumstances having been omitted in former Representations of it, which, if I mistake not, are very fit to be observed, in order to make a right Judgment of it. The Case is this.

' (n) KING Edward IV. in consideration of the <sup>(n) 9 Edw. 4.</sup>  
' good Services done him by *J. Bagot*, grants by his <sup>3 Term. Trin.</sup>  
' Letters Patent (*Anno 4 Edward. 4<sup>th</sup>*) to him and *W. Swirendon*  
' in Conjunction, or to the Survivor of them, the Office  
' of Clerk of the Crown in *Chancery*, after the Decease or  
' Surrender, &c. of one *William Rous*, then in Possession  
' of it. *Anno 6<sup>th</sup> Edw<sup>d</sup> 4<sup>th</sup>* *William Rous* surrenders this  
' Office; and then the said *Swirendon* and *Bagot* imme-  
' diately take Possession of it, by Virtue of the Letters  
' Patent beforementioned; and continued in this Office,  
' till one *Thomas Ives* disseized them of it, upon Pretence  
' likewise of Letters Patent dated *Anno 6<sup>th</sup> Edw<sup>d</sup> 4<sup>th</sup>*  
' *J. Bagot*, &c. upon this commence a Suit against *Tho-*  
' mas Ives, in which the said (o) *Ives* being Defendant, al- <sup>(o) 7 Edw. 4.</sup>  
' ledges against *Bagot*, that he was an Alien, born out of <sup>17 Term.</sup>  
' the Allegiance of the King of *England*, and under the <sup>Hil.</sup>  
' Obedience of *Charles* King of *France*, the King's great <sup>9 Edw. IV.</sup>  
' Adver- <sup>3 Term. Trin.</sup>



## The Hereditary Right of the

Adversary and Enemy. Bagot upon this shews a Patent of Naturalization, (p) granted him by King Henry VI. in the 37th Year of his Reign: Ives replies, That all the Regal Acts of the Three Henrys (q) being annulled by Act of Parliament, that Patent was consequently of no Authority. (r) Some time after came on another Tryal between Bagot and Ives; and then the Act of Parliament alledged by the Defendant, to invalidate the Patent granted by Henry VI. was considered; and it was affirmed by Bagot's Counsel, That notwithstanding that Act, the Patent of Naturalization granted to Bagot was good; for King Henry was King in Possession; and it was requisite, that the Kingdom should have a King, under whom the Laws might be kept, and Justice administered: Therefore altho' he was King only by Usurpation; yet every Judicial Act done by him, which concerns the Royal Jurisdiction, shall be good, and shall bind the King de Jure at his Return; and then they instance in a Pardon of Felony, a License of Mortmain, a Grant of Ward, &c. And that therefore the King that now is, shall have Advantage of all Forfeitures made to Henry VI.; and for a Trespass committed in his Time, the Writ shall run, *contra Pacem Henrici 6<sup>i</sup> nuper de Facto & non de Jure*; and a Man shall be arraign'd for Treason committed against the said King Henry, in compassing his Death: And therefore such Judicial Acts made by the said King Henry shall be good, provided they are not to the Diminution of his Crown; for then they shall be voided by the King that now is, in his ancient Right. Besides, this King Henry was not meerly an Usurper; for the Crown was entail'd upon him in Parliament. Then Judge Billing deliver'd his Opinion, That it belonged to every King, by reason of his Office, to do Justice, and shew Mercy; Justice in executing the Laws, and Mercy in granting Pardon to Felons, and such a Legitimation, as this of Bagot's, &c. And lastly, it was said, That if he, who is now King, had granted a Charter of Pardon in the Time of Henry VI. it would have been now void; for every one, that shall grant a Charter of Pardon, ought to be King in Fact, (s). And where-

(p) 9 Edw. 4. 3 Term. Trin.

(q) 7 Edw. 4. 17 Term. Hilar.

(r) 9 Edw. 4. 2 Term. Pasch.

(s) The Year-Book ends this Hearing with these Words, Et adjournatur. Et à cette

jour les Justices ne arguer, eins les Serjeants & Apprentices, i. e. Only the Serjeants and Apprentices on both sides argued that Day, and not the Judges.



as it had been urged by the Defendant, and his Counsel laid great (t) Stress upon it, That Bagot was an Alien, born in the Dominions of France, out of the King's Allegiance; this is utterly denied by (u) Bagot, who says, That his Parents were both English by Birth; and that he was born the King's Subject in his Duchy of Normandy; and the same is likewise affirmed in the (x) Letters Patent of Henry VI. On the other hand, (y) the Serjeants and Apprentices, who were of Counsel for Ives, would not allow these Letters Patent of Henry VI. to be good; For, say they, the King must not be in a worse Condition, than any common Person. If a common Person is disseized, and recovers Possession again, he shall defeat all the mean Acts; therefore the King shall do the same, now that he enjoys his Right, descended to him from King Richard. Besides, this Act (viz. the 1st of Edward IV, which voids the Acts of the Three Henrys) is nothing else, but an Affirmance of Common Law; therefore by his Regress he has voided all Acts made by the Usurper; and upon this Account it is, that in the said Act he has excepted all Judicial Acts, &c. and declared them good; but for the Validity of these Letters Patent, no Provision is made in it. And then as a farther Proof, that the Acts of a King de Facto are of no Authority, they add; That a League made between King Henry VI. and any other Foreign Prince, tho' intended for the Advantage of the Realm, shall not bind the King that now is. And at the last (z) Hearing of this Cause, Judge Bryan opposed the giving Judgment for Bagot, for this Reason; because the King being now in his Remitter, as Cousin and Heir to King Richard, the Patent made by King Henry, who was only an Usurper and Intruder, was void. At length, after several Hearings, the Judges having debated the Matter, resolved, (a) that no Objection had been offered of Weight enough to procure an Arrest of Judgment; and so Bagot was put in Possession of his Office.

(t) 9 Edw. 4.  
2 Term.  
Pasch.

(u) 9 Edw. 4.  
3 Term.  
Trin.

(x) 9 Edw.  
4. 3 Term.  
Trin.

(y) 9 Edw.  
4. 2 Term.  
Pasch.

(z) 9 Edw.  
4. 3 Term.  
Trin.

(a) 9 Edw.  
4. 3 Term.  
Trin.

THIS, I will presume to say, is a true and full Representation of this celebrated Case; for it was my Intention to omit nothing, that could possibly be thought material; and I am persuaded, I have executed my Design. I shall therefore with some Confidence refer it to the Reader, First, Whether the Doctor's Memory or Skill did not fail him, in some Parts of the View he has



given of it. *Secondly*, Whether the Inferences he draws from it are so evident and just, as he imagines. And, *Thirdly*, Whether in Truth any Propositions can be extracted from it, that will serve his Purpose.

(b) *View of  
the English  
Constitution,  
p. 17. And  
Defence,  
p. 58.*

*First*, I desire the Reader's Opinion, Whether the Doctor's Memory or Skill did not fail him, in some Parts of the View he has given of this Case: For he tells us with no little Assurance, (b) *That the opposite Counsel did not deny any one of the Points of Law maintained in Bagot's Plea*; and then with an Air peculiar to great Writers, asks the Question; *Wou'd not the Counsel on the other side have contradicted or answered, if they could, what had been urged in behalf of Bagot, as it concern'd their Client's Cause?*

(c) 9 Edw.  
4. 2 Term.  
Pasch.

I confess, it is not without some Amazement, that I look upon these Passages in the Doctor's Book; and I now appeal to the Reader, whether there is not reason for it: Let him but cast his Eye upon what I have just now recited; and let him judge between us, whether the following Words do not contain a direct and full Answer made by *Ives's* Counsel to that of *Bagot*. And (c) *on the other side* (that is, *Ives's*) *it was touched by the Serjeants and Apprentices, that the Letters Patent shall be void; for the King (the King de Jure) must not be in a worse Condition, than any common Person. If a common Person is disfeiz'd, and recovers Possession again, he shall defeat all the mean Acts; therefore the King shall do the same, now that he enjoys his Right, descended to him from King Richard. Besides, this Act (viz. 1 Edw. IV, which voids the Acts of the Three Henrys) is nothing else, but an Affirmance of Common Law; therefore by his Regress he has voided all Acts made by the Usurper; and upon this account it is, that in the said Act he has excepted all Judicial Acts, &c. and declared them good; but for the Validity of these Letters Patent, no Provision is made in it.* I would now leave it to the Doctor himself, what can be the Meaning of these Words? Is it not plain from them, that the Plaintiff's Counsel denied what the Defendant's affirmed? *Bagot's* Lawyers are positive, that *Henry VI's* Letters Patent are good; because all Judicial Acts done by an Usurper shall be good, and bind the King *de Jure* at his Return. But *Ives's* Lawyers answer, that these Letters Patent shall be void; because otherwise the King should be in a worse Condition, than a common Person, &c. and therefore they



they add, That all Acts done by an Usurper are void; and that even the Judicial Acts had not been good, but by Virtue of *Edward IV.*'s Confirmation; but then they deny, that these Letters Patent could come under the Denomination of Judicial Acts. Is not this a manifest Contradiction to the Plea of *Bagot's* Counsel; and a plain Denial of the Points of Law contain'd in it? And if it is so, I must be allowed to say, the Doctor has not fairly represented the Case.

Secondly, *Bagot's Case*, says our (d) Author, is the only (d) *View*, one, where the Authority of a King de Facto had ever been P. 14. disputed; and yet even then not disputed at Common Law: For the Counsel against *Bagot* seem'd well enough aware, that the Authority of a King de Facto was good at Common Law, &c. Nothing surely can be more directly contrary to the express Words of *Ives's* Counsel, than this Assertion of the Doctor's; for as they lie in the Year-Books, they are these which follow. (e) *That Act* (meaning the First of *Ed-* (e) *Edw. 4* ward IV, which annuls the Acts and Grants of the Three <sup>3</sup> Term. Trin. Henrys) is only an Affirmance of the Common Law; and therefore King Edward, at his Regress, voided all the Acts made by the Usurper, &c. Does it appear from hence, that they were aware, that the Authority of a King de Facto was good at Common Law; when they undeniably affirm, that by Common Law all the Acts of Usurpers are to be declared void? I am ashamed of making the Reflexions, which are natural upon this Occasion.

SECONDLY, I am now to enquire, whether the Inferences he draws from this Case, are so evident and just, as he imagines. And in order to this, I must desire it may be remember'd, that the Grand Position, which, the Doctor would persuade us, is demonstrable from the (f) Pro- (f) *View*, ceedings now before us, is this; *That the Authority of a King* P. 8, &c. de Facto was fully own'd and acknowledged in the Courts of Judicature of King Edward IV, a King de Jure. And this (g) he is pleas'd to infer, First, From the Pleadings of (g) P. 50. *Bagot's* Counsel; and Secondly, From the Judgment, which was at length given for him. I shall now consider the Force of the Doctor's Arguments, from which he deduces his Conclusion; and I think I shall be able to make it appear, that they will by no means serve his Purpose.

First, He inferrs from the Plea of *Bagot's* Counsel, that the Law allowed of the Authority of Kings de Facto.

But



(b) *View*,  
P. 17.

(i) *View*,  
*ibid.*

But might not that Counsel err in those Points, which they urged for Law? And were they exempted from the common Infirmities, which the ablest Lawyers have been subject to, of being sometimes mistaken? The Doctor indeed, as aware of this Objection, tells us, (b) *The opposite Counsel would certainly have denied these Points of Law, if they were not evident.* But I have already shew'd, that the Doctor's Accuracy here fail'd him; nothing being more true, than that *the opposite Counsel did deny the Points of Law maintain'd in Bagot's Plea.* So that here we have Counsel against Counsel; and consequently (according to the Doctor's Way of Reasoning) Law against Law; and then the Question still remains, which Side was on the Right; and which it was, the Law did really favour; so that the Authority of Kings *de Facto* is not yet a decided Truth. The Doctor therefore seems to be sensible, that his Assertion needed a farther Support; and for that Reason asks, (i) *Can any Man believe, that in the Courts of Edward IV, who had waded through so much Blood to the Throne, and was so jealous of any thing, that favoured the Lancastrian Kings, they durst have made this Plea, if they had not known it to be Law?* To this I answer; I see nothing in this Plea, which could give any just Offence to *Edward IV*, or his Party: For that Prince had only Cause to be jealous of those Opinions, that favoured the Right and Claim of the *Lancastrian Kings*; not of such, as only asserted the Reasonableness of allowing the *Judicial Acts* of the *Three Henrys*, and such other, as were necessary for the *Order of Government* in general, and were not prejudicial to his own Title; which, I doubt not, will appear to be the only Use, that can be fairly made of this Plea. But supposing the Case to be as the Doctor represents it; I cannot however see the Necessity of his Consequence; for why may it not sometimes happen, that a Counsel should use an undue Liberty in their Pleadings; and that in a Point of Moment too, without any real Warrant from Law; and yet meet with no Reprehension from the Judges? Is Modesty inseparable from the Gentlemen only of that Profession? Or is it impossible for Courts of Justice to be guilty of too much Lenity and Patience towards those, who would have their Boldness pass for Law? I freely own, that if the Judges understood the Plea of *Bagot's Counsel*, in  
the



the Sense the Doctor does, and thought they were in the Wrong, they ought to have resented their Presumption, and rebuked them for it; but if they thought them in the Right, and believed they said nothing, but what was agreeable to the Laws; why then did they suffer *Ives's* Council to argue with that Confidence, against so sacred a Thing as the *Constitution*? Behold, how audaciously they affirm to the Court, *(k) That the King de Jure shall defeat all the mean Acts of the King de Facto, when he recovers his Right.* *(k) 9 Edw. IV. 2 Term. Pasch.* That the first of Edward IV, (which voids the Grants of the Three *Henrys*) is nothing else, but an Affirmance of Common Law, which gave him Authority to void all the Acts of the Usurper his Predecessor. Were there ever more scandalous and insufferable Affronts offer'd to the Laws and Constitution of *England*, in the Doctor's Opinion? And therefore surely the Serjeants and Apprentices, who ventured to utter them, ought to have felt the Weight of the Judges Indignation for such unparalleled Boldness: But since it appears, they escaped with Impunity, will the Doctor therefore give his Adversaries Leave to infer, that the Court allowed of their Plea? Have they not the same Right to reason after this Manner, as the Doctor has? And if his Argument thus returns upon him; it will become him to be sensible, that it is not worth his while to insist upon it. Upon this Occasion I hope it will not be impertinent to put him in mind of a Passage, which happen'd at the Tryal of *Algernon Sydney*. That Gentleman had been charged with Writing some treasonable Papers found in his Closet; he denies indeed, that he wrote them; but after the Reading them in Court, he had the Confidence to say, he did not know, why any body should be ashamed of being the Author of them. *(l) For (says he) they seem to be an Answer to Filmer, who maintains this Principle, That 'tis the same thing, whether a King come in by Election, by Donation, by Inheritance, or Usurpation, or any other way; than which I think never was a thing more desperately said.* *(l) Tryal of Argernon Sydney, p. 32, 33.* Cromwell, when one White a Priest wrote a Book, wherein he undertook to prove, That Possession was the only Right to Power; though he was a Tyrant, and a violent one, thought it so odious a Principle, that he would not endure it, and used him very slightly for it. Now this Filmer is the Man, that does assert it, that 'tis no matter, how they come by their Power;



and gives the same Power to the worst Usurpers, as they, that most rightly come to the Crown. By the same Argument, if the errantest Rascal of Israel had killed Moses, David, &c. and seiz'd upon the Power; he had been possessed of that Power, and been Father of the People. If this be Doctrine, my Lord, that is Just and Good, then I confess it may be dangerous for any thing to be found in a Man's House contrary to it, &c.

Now the Use I would make of that Passage, is this; It is plain, it contains a Doctrine directly opposite to a very considerable Part of the *English Constitution*, if the Doctor is in the right: It is utterly inconsistent with those Notions, which he maintains are evidently supported by the *Common and Statute Laws* of his Country, and have been confirmed by the constant Example and Practice of the greatest Men, for above Six Hundred Years: And yet the *Chief Justice*, the *Judges* then upon the *Bench*, the *Attorney and Solicitor-General*, and the rest of the King's Learned Counsel permitted the Laws of the Nation to be arraigned in so publick a Manner, without the least Censure or Reproof. I would now ask the Doctor, if I might presume so far, Whether such an Omission in those that presided at that Tryal, could fairly be interpreted as a Concession, that what Mr. Sydney said was true?

(m) *View of  
the English  
Constitution,*  
p. 17, 18.

LASTLY, the Doctor (m) concludes, from the Judgment given in Favour of *Bagot*, that the Court plainly declared for the *Validity of the King de Facto's Patent*; and consequently of his *Royal Jurisdiction*, though not confirmed by the King *de Jure*, in a Statute made expressly for that Purpose.

THESE Words are home, I confess; and would be fully to the Doctor's Purpose, if they were true; but that I must beg Leave to doubt of, for the following Reasons:

*First*, Because the Judgment for *Bagot* did not necessarily imply the *Validity of the Patent of Henry VI.*

*Secondly*, Because, supposing the Patent of *Henry VI.* were declared valid by Virtue of this Judgment; yet it would not be a good Proof of his Authority in the present Question.

*First*, I say the Judgment for *Bagot* did not necessarily imply the *Validity of the Patent of Henry VI.* upon the Certainty of which the Doctor entirely depends in his present



present Argument ; for he does not pretend to infer the Authority of a King *de Facto* from any other *Medium*, but that of the Validity of his Patent : But if that cannot be proved from this Judgment, we are then just where we were ; and we must wait for happier Discoveries, before we admit of the Authority of Kings *de Facto*.

THE Reader will be pleased to remember, that the Point aim'd at by *Bagot* in this Tryal, was to get Possession again of the Office, to which he laid Claim by the Grant of *Edward IV* ; and that after several Hearings, at length the Judges declare, *That nothing had been suggested of Weight enough to cause an Arrest of Judgment* ; and then they proceed to give it for *Bagot*, viz. *That he shall recover his Office, &c.* Now I must here observe, that it does not appear, upon what Grounds and Reasons they gave this Judgment ; the Doctor indeed is positive, that it was by Virtue of the Patent of *Henry VI.* which they allowed to be good : But how does he know that ? Was there no other Motive suggested in *Bagot's* Plea, that could possibly induce them to determine for him ? If there was ; then the Doctor must confess his Cause is still doubtful. Now it is evident, that tho' *Bagot* did plead the Patent of Naturalization of *Henry VI.* to qualify him for this Office ; yet he also (n) affirmed, that he was <sup>(n) 9 Edw. 4. 3 Term. Trin.</sup> born of English Parents in the King's Duchy of Normandy ; and consequently had a just Claim to the Rights and Privileges of an English Subject, tho' his Patent of Naturalization were set aside ; for if this should not be allowed to be a Legal Title, we must at once reject all my Lord Chief Justice Coke's Arguments in *Calvin's Case*, and the several Judgments given for the *Post-Nati*, by the ablest Lawyers, in King *James I.*'s Reign ; the Doctor ought not therefore to think it improbable, that the Court was influenced by this Reason, in the Judgment they gave for *Bagot*. But,

Secondly, Supposing the Patent of *Henry VI.* were admitted to be *valid*, by Virtue of this Judgment ; yet this would not be a sufficient Proof, that his Authority was allowed of in the Courts of *Edward IV* : For the Patent might derive its Force only from the Authority of *Edward IV*, who confirmed it ; not from any that was acknowledg'd to be in *Henry VI.* And the Truth is, this is all that *Bagot's Counsel* pretended to ; for it is plain they contend



## The Hereditary Right of the

contend only for these Two Points: *First*, That all the *Judicial Acts* of Henry VI, should be allowed to be good. *Secondly*, That this *Patent of Naturalization* should be admitted to be a *Judicial Act*: Now the opposite Counsel very readily grant, that the *Judicial Acts* of Henry VI. were declared Valid by the first of *Edward IV*; but then they do not agree, that this *Patent* was of the Nature of a *Judicial Act*: So that if at last the *Court* was of Opinion, (which is not unlikely, and may be true, for any thing that appears to the contrary) that this *Patent* might very well come under the Denomination of a *Judicial Act*; it was then consequently confirmed by *Edward IV*; and therefore ought to be look'd upon as sufficient for the Purpose, for which it was produced; but then this is only a Proof of the Authority of *Edward IV*, not of that of *Henry VI*, as I before observed. The Doctor possibly may be of the same Opinion with *Ives's* Counsel, and deny that this *Patent* was a *Judicial Act*; but then he differs from his old Friends, the Managers of *Bagot's* Plea, upon whose Judgment he has hitherto thought he might safely depend: And besides, it appears from another Case in the (o) *Year-Books*, that all *Acts of Record* enter'd in *Chancery*, may properly be term'd *Judicial Acts*; for the Chief Justice *Markham* having there questioned the Authority of *Coroners* chosen in the Time of *Henry VI*, *Yelverton* and *Choke* answer, (p) *That the Election of a Coroner being certified in Chancery, is an Act of Record, and a Judicial Act; in which Case, all Judicial Acts done in the Time of the last King, are affirmed by the King and all his Council.* Which does not only furnish us with a fresh Confutation of what the Doctor had affirmed, viz. *That Bagot's Case was the only one, in which the Authority of a King de Facto had been ever disputed*; but also seems to be a clear Proof, that *Bagot's Patent of Naturalization* being an *Act of Record*, ought to be look'd upon as a *Judicial Act*. So that after a due and full Examination of this famous Case, which has so often been appealed to, and is infi-

(o) 4 Edw. 4. 3 Term. Hilar.

(p) Quant à ceo qui est dit, que les *Coroners* avant dit, ne fuerent nouvellement eslués en Temps, le Roy qui ore est, issint que ils ne sont *Coroners* à Roy. 1. al Roy qui ore est, &c. Semble que ils sont; Car le *Coroner* n'ad Commission, si come auter *Minister* ad, ou come au-

ter *Judge* ad; mes per bref le Roy il est eslué; quel Election certifie en le *Chancery* est *Act de Record*, & *Judicial Act*, en quel Case al *Meins Judicial Acts* fait en Temps le Roy qui fuir, sont affirme par le Roy & tout son Conseil, 4 Edw. 4. 3 & 4 Term. Hilar.



sted upon by the Doctor, as *decisive* in the present Controversy; we are still as much in the Dark as ever: It is not certain that the *Judges* thought *Henry VI.*'s *Patent* was valid; or if they did, it is not certain, but they might think so from the Confirmation of *Edward IV.*, not from any Authority it deriv'd from *Henry VI.*; and therefore it remains still to be proved, That the *Courts of Judicature* fully acknowledged the Authority of *Kings de Facto*.

I MIGHT now very excusably dismiss this Argument, and persuade myself, I have said enough to render it useless and unserviceable to the Purpose, for which it has been urged; but possibly it may be expected, I should take a little more Notice of the *Points of Law* (as the Doctor is pleas'd to call them) contain'd in the Plea of *Bagot's Counsel*: I shall therefore now endeavour to gratify him in this respect; and I doubt not but to make it appear, that these *Points of Law*, understood in his Sense, do certainly prove too much; but if we are to understand them according to their natural, obvious, and, I think, only true Meaning; they will then as manifestly prove too little.

First, I say, these *Points of Law*, understood in the Doctor's Sense, do certainly prove too much; because the Authority of all Governments *de Facto* may as well be infer'd from them, as that of *Kings de Facto*: Which is more than the Doctor will be willing should follow from any of his Positions. For when his Adversaries had objected, that his Arguments had a plain Tendency to maintain the Legality of all the Publick *Acts* of the late *Republick*, and *Oliver Cromwell*; it is observable, with what Indignation (q) he resents the Charge of such a Consequence; and reproaches them with the Guilt of that Absurdity, which they intended to fasten upon him: But how great soever may be the Displeasure I must expect to incur by this Imputation; it is to me evident, that the Reasons made use of by *Bagot's Counsel*, will serve the Cause of a *Commonwealth*, as well as that of a *King de Facto*: As will easily appear by a particular Examination of them:

(q) Defence;  
p. 106.

First, It is said to be necessary, *the Realm should have a King, under whom the Laws should be kept and maintained*. Very good; but a *King* then is only necessary for the sake of Government: And may not that End be obtain-



ed under a *Commonwealth*? The Laws may be better executed perhaps by a King, than a *Cromwell*; or a *Republick*; but if a King is not to be had, it is *necessary* to have some other *Government*; because otherwise the Laws could not be kept, nor maintained. To whatsoever Powers therefore we are beholden for that Benefit; they must have the same Authority, as a King *de Facto*. The Counsel proceed; *Therefore altho' he was in but by Usurpation*; yet every *Judicial Act* done by him, concerning the *Royal Jurisdiction*, shall hold good, and shall bind the King *de Jure*, when he returns to the Crown, &c. Thus *Charters of Pardon* shall be good, &c. Their Argument is still grounded upon the Principles of common Justice and Equity; and why may not these take place under a *Commonwealth*, as well as a *Monarchy*? They go on; *The King that now is, shall have the Advantage of all Forfeitures made to King Henry VI.* True; and so had King *Charles II.* the *Forfeitures* made to the *Commonwealth*: And therefore according to this Argument, the *Commonwealth* was a Legal Government. It follows; *And for a Trespass committed in Henry VI.'s Time, the Writ shall run contra pacem Henrici 6<sup>ti</sup> nuper de Facto & non de Jure.*

HERE, I confess, I am at a Loss how to proceed; for I am loath to believe, that for *Trespases* committed under the *Commonwealth* or *Oliver Cromwell*, the Writs should run (in the Reign of King *Charles II.*) *contra Pacem Reipublicæ*, or *contra Pacem Oliveri nuper Angliæ Protectoris, &c.* and yet, according to the Doctrine of *Bagot's* Counsel, and the Doctor's Principles, it seems to be unavoidable. For how could an *Indictment* for Crimes committed under the *Commonwealth* otherwise be formed? Surely it would not be proper to say, That *Trespases* committed under the late *Republick*, were *contra Pacem Caroli Regis*; for he being out of *Possession*, could not grant a *Pardon*. [View. p. 16.] He could afford his Subjects no *Protection*, and therefore no *Allegiance* was due to him. [View, p. 52. Def. p. 111.] But after all, I find myself mistaken; for it was *Resolved* by all the Judges, that the *Indictment* for the Murder of King *Charles I.* should conclude, *contra pacem nuper Domini Regis, & dignit. suas, necnon contra pacem Domini Regis nunc, coron. & dignit. suas.* And it was likewise declared by them, *That tho' King Charles II. was de Facto kept out of the*  
Exercise



*Exercise of the Kingly Office by Traytors and Rebels ; yet he was King both de Facto and de Jure. [Kelyng's Reports, p. 11, 15.]* Now the Question is, Who were the better Lawyers, Bagot's Counsel, or these Judges? If the latter, then Henry VI. was not so much as King *de Facto*.

THE next Point seems to be peculiar to the Case of Henry VI ; and not extensive enough to be applied to all Kings *de Facto*. It is this : *A Man shall be arraign'd for Treason against King Henry VI. in compassing his Death ; because the said King was not meerly an Usurper, &c.* I say, this is a Privilege, which belongs only to such Kings, as are not *meerly Usurpers* ; and therefore will not prove the Authority of Kings *de Facto* in general ; which was the Doctor's proper Business. It is true, my Lord Chief Justice Hale (in his large *Pleas of the Crown*, not yet printed) is of Opinion, That *Treasons committed against an Usurper, or Rex de Facto & non de Jure, shall be punished after the Regress and Obtention of the Crown by the Right Heir.* But then he affirms this with such Limitations, as I fancy will not be very acceptable to the Doctor : His Words are these ; (r) *If there be a Treason committed against the Usurper, which refers not to the Competition of the True Heir, as counterfeiting the Coin or Seal of the Usurper, compassing his Death by Treachery, &c. these Treasons have been punished notwithstanding the Regress of the Right Heir, and in his Time,* 9 Edw. 4. 1. 4 Edw. 4. 20. *For these are indeed Offences, that are rather against the Interest of Kingly Government, than the Interest of the Usurper. But if the Treasons be such Acts, as were done in the Right and Assistance of the Right Heir to the Crown ; these are purged by the Regress and Obtention of the Crown by the Right Heir.*

(r) Hale's  
MS. Hist.  
Plac. Co-  
ronæ, Vol. 1.  
c. 13.

I INTREAT the Reader now to judge, whether the same thing may not be said, with relation to the same Offences committed under a Commonwealth. Are they not such, as are rather against the Interest of Government in general, and therefore deserve to be punished even by a King *de Jure* at his *Restoration*? To return to the *Points of Law* insisted upon by Bagot's Counsel ; they add, *Any Gifts or Grants made by King Henry, which were not to the Diminution of the Crown, shall be made good.* If these Words are to be understood without any Restriction, they are not true ; for Edward IV. did by Act of Parliament vacate several Grants of Henry VI. which were  
not



not to the *Diminution of the Crown*; and surely the Counsel would not say, he could not do that lawfully, which he had actually done by Law. But if they mean no more, than that *many Gifts or Grants made by King Henry, which were not to the Diminution of the Crown, shall be made good*; this will admit of no Dispute: But then what Reason can be assign'd, why a Commonwealth should not have the Benefit of the like Plea? The last Particular, that was urged in this Case, was, *That if he that is now King, had in King Henry VI.'s Time granted a Charter of Pardon, it would be void now; for every one that shall grant a Charter of Pardon, must be King in Fact.* This may in some Sense be true, and yet be of no Advantage to the Cause of Kings *de Facto*: For if by Henry VI.'s Time, we are to understand the Time preceding the 4th of March, when Edward IV. first took upon him the Name and Authority of a King; undoubtedly a Pardon then granted by the said Edward, could not be good; because he had not yet publish'd his Claim to the Crown; nor made use of the Regal Style. But the Reason subjoin'd plainly shews, the Counsel were of Opinion, That no Pardon granted by a Prince out of Possession, could be valid. Now I might question whether this was held to be Law at King Charles II.'s Restoration; for when some of the Regicides, at their Tryal, laid hold on the King's Declaration made at Breda, as a Grant of Pardon; they were told by the Chief Baron and Solicitor General, that it could only be a Pardon in Honour, not in Law; because it wanted the Broad-Seal; which Answer (s) seem'd to imply, That if it had been under the Broad-Seal, it would have been a Legal Pardon, tho' granted by a King out of Possession. But if the Doctor will insist upon it, as a good Law, that a King out of Possession has no manner of Authority; certainly, in the Time of King Charles's Exile, Cromwell had as much the Benefit of that Law, as if he had been King *de Facto*.

(s) It does not bind him in Point of Law, unless there were a Pardon granted by the Broad-Seal. These are Chief Baron Bridgman's Words, at the Tryal of Mr. Cooke. Tryal of the Regicides, p. 145.

I HAVE now gone through the Doctor's *Points of Law*; and have shewed, that the Equity of them will undoubtedly extend to all Governments, as well as to Kings *de Facto*.

BUT, Secondly, If we understand these *Points of Law* in their proper and natural Signification; they prove no more, than that under an Usurper the Course of Judicial



*Proceedings* ought to go on, which consist partly of *Acts of Justice*, and partly of *Acts of Grace*; of which latter sort were *Patents of Naturalization*, as Judge *Billing* urged; that during the Exclusion and Exile of the Rightful Prince, the Order of Government should still be preserved, and consequently the Laws put in Execution; and that therefore all such Acts as these, tho' performed by an Usurper, (since they had no other End and Tendency, but to maintain the Peace and Quiet of Society in general, and did not directly oppose the Claim, or weaken the Interest of the Lawful Heir) ought in Reason and Equity to be declared good and valid to all Intents and Purposes. This, I say, is the utmost, that can fairly be inferred from the *Plea of Bagot's Counsel*, without doing Violence to the plain and obvious Meaning of it; and indeed it would not be reconcilable with those avowed Principles, by Virtue of which *Edward IV.* gained the Crown; nor consistent with itself, were the Doctor's Exposition of it admitted as genuine. It would not be reconcilable with the Principles that placed *Edward IV.* upon the Throne; because it utterly destroys the Distinction between King *de Facto*, and King *de Jure*, by supposing Allegiance to be due only to the Prince in *Possession*. And for the same Reason it is inconsistent with itself; because it allows of this Distinction, and confesses that *Henry VI.* was King only by *Usurpation*; a Term which manifestly implies Unjust Possession; and consequently such, as the Law gives no manner of Countenance or Approbation to. On the other hand, the Sense which I have now given of it, is attended with no Inconveniencies, nor liable to any Objections. It maintains inviolably the Right and Authority of Kings *de Jure*; and yet allows to the *Judicial Acts* of a King *de Facto*, and all other that were done purely for the Preservation of the Community, an equitable Title to a Confirmation from the King *de Jure*. And this indeed is all that *Bagot's Counsel* had Occasion to demand; for this being admitted, they had Reason to hope, the Patent of *Naturalization*, granted by *Henry VI.* would come under the Denomination of a *Judicial Act*; and then their Clients Cause could be in no Danger.

I MUST beg Leave to observe one thing more, before I have done with this tedious Plea; and that is,

K k

that



that the Counsel argue only for the Validity of the Acts of *Henry VI*, not of *Usurpers* or *Kings de Facto* in general, as the Doctor does; for they tell us, that *Henry* was King in Possession; and that though *he was so by Usurpation*, yet *he was not merely an Usurper*. But it ought not to be from hence inferred, that this must be the Case of every King *de Facto*; or that all *Kings de Facto* ought to have the same Privileges, that it might be thought reasonable to allow *Henry VI*: For every *Usurper* may not have the same Plea, as those of the House of *Lancaster* had, especially the two last of them, who had obtained the Promises and Oaths of the *Undoubted Heirs*, for the Security of their Reign. I do not say, the House of *York* had hereby laid themselves under any *Legal Obligations*, never to lay Claim to the Crown; for the Judgment given afterwards in Parliament against *Henry VI*, shews the contrary: But it may be very well doubted, whether those repeated Oaths, which were taken likewise with so much Solemnity, ought not to have had a greater Weight upon their Consciences, than it appeared they had; and it is to be feared, the Calamities which befell the *Duke of York and his Issue*, are in a great Measure to be attributed to the little Reverence that Family paid to *Oaths*, and the slender Care they took to perform them. However, though *Edward IV.* possess'd himself of the Crown, without any Regard to these Obligations; he could not but be sensible, that *Henry VI.* deserved to be consider'd with some Distinction, as one that had a Right to better Usage, than Common *Usurpers*; for he had lived under him many Years in great Honour and Prosperity; and seem'd contented and satisfied with his Government: So that he had Reason to look upon the Acts of *Henry VI.* as done by his own Consent and Approbation; and therefore might think himself obliged in Prudence and Decency to ratify and confirm them. But the Doctor knows the Case is very different of *Usurpers*, who never had so much as the Appearance of the Consent of the Right Heirs for their Possession; and therefore are necessitated to maintain themselves in the Throne by Force and Violence.

THE Doctor's last Remark upon this Case, is taken from *Brook's Abridgment*, whose Words he sets down; but they amount to no more than this, *That it is said,*  
and



and not contradicted, that for Treason committed against a King de Facto, the Party shall be arraign'd under a King de Jure. How little this is to the Doctor's Purpose, I have already in some Measure shewed; and need at present only take Notice of the Method of Reasoning here made use of; *It is said, and not contradicted*; be it so: But is it not said likewise by the opposite Counsel, and not contradicted, that the King shall not be in a worse Condition, than any common Person; and that therefore he shall, at his Return, defeat all the mean Acts of the Intruder; and that the first of Edward IV. (which annuls all the Acts and Grants of Henry VI.) was only an Affirmance of Common Law? Do Bagot's Counsel make any Reply to this? Or do the Judges pass any Censure upon it? Is not their Silence therefore as much an Argument of their Consent, on this Side of the Question, as my Lord Brook would have it on the other?

THERE is indeed a remarkable Case in the Year-Books, not taken Notice of by the Doctor; which yet may be thought more to his Purpose, than any of his other Citations from those Volumes: I shall here therefore lay it before the Reader, that I may be acquitted of any Intention of concealing what may seem to countenance the Opinion I write against. It is this which follows: (t) Ralph Grey Knt. being taken in actual Rebellion against Edward IV, in the Castle of Brambrough; he was carried to Doncaster; and there deprived of the Honour of Knighthood in an ignominious Manner; his gilt Spurs being hewed off his Feet; his Sword and all his Armour being likewise broken and taken from him in the open Field. After this he was Beheaded; and the Reason of this Severity against him, was, for his Perjury and Doubleness, as well towards the late King Henry VI, as Edward IV, that now is. I confess there is an Appearance of Difficulty in this Passage, which I shall endeavour to explain.

WE are told by (u) Holinshead, that this Sir Ralph Grey had sworn to be true to Edward IV, and consequent-

(t) 4 Edw. 4. 4 Term. Pasch. Et le dit Sir Ralph Grey fut cary a Doncastre, & la fut Deprive del Honor del Chevalier devant mults del Peuple le Roy. 1. ses gilt Spores heves de ses pees, & son espee & tout son armour sur luy debruse & pris de luy en le champ, & puis il decolle.

Et le cause del cel punishment de luy en siel maner, fut per cause de son Perjury & Doubleness que il avoit fait al Roy Henry le Size jadis Roy, &c. & auxy al Roy Edward le Quart, qui ore est, &c.

(u) Chron. A.D. 1463.



ly had deserted *Henry VI*, to whom before he had taken an Oath of *Allegiance*; but surely this could not be the *Perjury and Doubleness*, for which he is here said to be punished by *Edward IV*; for then it must have been unlawful to embrace his Interest; and those numerous *Attainders*, which were passed against the Adherents of *Henry VI*, were so many Instances of the highest Violence and Injustice. Was Fidelity to the House of *Lancaster* at the same Time a Crime, and a Duty? That is, was it Treason against *Henry VI*, to revolt from him, and at the same Instant, Treason against *Edward IV*, to adhere to him? Certainly no Government could be guilty of such a Contradiction; or if it could, this wonderful Piece of *Justice* would have been most conspicuous in the Execution of the Duke of *Somerſet*; who (x) was most remarkably guilty of a Breach of his Allegiance to both those Princes; and yet we no-where find this *Doubleness* charged upon him, as Part of his Indictment. My Lord Chief Justice *Hale* therefore delivers it as his Opinion, that this *Perjury and Doubleness* against *Henry VI*, of which Sir *Ralph Grey* is here accused, must be understood of some Act of Treason he had committed in the Reign of that King, which was not intended for the Service of *Edward IV*, the *Rightful Heir*. But his own Words will best explain his Meaning, which I shall therefore here set down. (y) It is Treason in any Subject, while an Usurper is in full Possession of the Sovereignty, to practise Treason against his Person. And therefore although the true Prince regain his Sovereignty, yet such Attempts against the Usurper in compassing his Death, have been punished as Treason, unless they were Attempts made in the Right of the Rightful Prince; or in Aid, or Assistance of him; because of the Breach of *Liegeance*, which was temporarily due to him who was King *de Facto*. And thus it was done, 4 *Edw. 4.* 40. 9 *Edw. 4.* 2. though *Henry VI.* was declared an Usurper by Act of Parliament, the first of *Edward IV.* And therefore King *Edward* punished *Ralph Grey* with Degradation, as well as Death, not only for his Rebellion against himself, but also pur cause de son *Perjury & Doubleness* qu'il avoit fait al Roy *Hen. 6.* Thus did that *Illustrious Ornament of the Bench* understand the Case I am now speaking of; from whence it is plain, his Opinion of the Powers which belong to a King *de Facto*, is not in the least prejudicial to the

(x) See *Holinhead's Chron.*

(y) *MS. Hist. Plac. Coronæ, l. i. c. 10.*



the *Rights of a King de Jure* ; for it supposes the Allegiance due to a *King de Facto*, to be only *Temporary* and subordinate ; and that it could not destroy the *indefeasible* Title of the *King de Jure* ; as the *Local Allegiance* which an *English* Subject owes to a Foreign Prince, while he continues in his Dominions, does not extinguish the prior and indispensable Obligation he is under to his *Natural* Sovereign ; but when his Duty calls, and Opportunity favours, he is bound to attend the Commands of his Lawful Prince. So that if this Exposition of the Case before us is admitted and allowed, the Friends to the Doctor's Notion will be no great Gainers by it. But I must confess, as reasonable as this Solution of the Difficulty may seem to be, I am by no means inclined to allow this *pretended Case* any manner of Authority in the present Question ; for I am persuaded, it will be found, upon Examination, to have no Right to any Place in the *Year-Books*. I am sensible, it becomes me to be very circumspect, when I advance any thing that is singular in a Part of Learning, with which I am but slenderly acquainted : I shall only therefore propose my Opinion, with the Grounds of it ; and leave its Probability to be determin'd by those, whose Profession has qualified them to be proper Judges.

I PRESUME to take it for granted, that the *Year-Books* are only authoritative, as they are faithful Reports of Proceedings in the Courts of Common Law ; as they represent the *Pleadings*, and relate the Judgments given, in the several Cases, with Truth and Fidelity : For which only Reason they have been from Time to Time approved and recommended by the Judges, as proper Guides and Directions for Practice in their Courts. If it should appear therefore, that some Cases, or Passages, are inserted as adjudged in those Volumes, which were never pleaded before either Bench, and are not properly cognizable by them ; their Credit ought to be suspected, as not sufficiently warranted ; and to be sure they can never have any Influence upon Proceedings at Common Law. Now the Case before us is certainly liable to this and other Objections. As first, it contains an Historical Relation of the Success of *Edward IV*, against the Rebels in the North, which could not possibly be pleaded in any *Court of Judicature* ; for if it had been ever



*The Hereditary Right of the*

pleaded, it must have been at the Tryal of this Sir Ralph Grey, to whom it chiefly relates: But it is evident, several Historical Passages occur in it, which did not happen till at least five Years after: For Instance, it appears from this Case, and our *Chronicles* agree with it, that Sir Ralph Grey was carried to Doncaster, and Beheaded soon after he was taken, which fell out in the fourth Year of Edward IV.'s Reign; but it is manifest likewise from this (z) same Case, that Sir Humphrey Neville, who was taken about the same Time, was not executed till five Years after. This Case therefore could not be pleaded at the Tryal of Sir Ralph Grey; neither can it be pretended, that it was then drawn up as a Report of the Proceedings that then happen'd; since it contains an Account of some Matters of Fact, which did not come to pass till several Years following. Secondly, The Proceedings here mention'd at the Tryal of this Sir Ralph Grey, are not usual in the Courts of *Common Law*; but seem rather to be the Practice of the *Court Marshal*: And the Truth is, (a) John Stow assures us, that Sir Ralph Grey had Judgment given upon him by the (b) Earl of Worcester, High Constable of England; whose Relation of this Matter is approved of by Mr. (c) Selden; so that then this Judgment was given in a *Court Marshal*, (d) where absolute Power, and not the Laws of the Land, take place; which must very much increase our Wonder, how it came to find Room in the *Year-Books*, which were most certainly drawn up and published for the Service of the *Common Law Courts*. We are not like to be resolved therefore by this Case, in the Question about the Authority of Kings *de Facto*; for when we enquire after their Power, and desire to be informed by what Laws they pretend to challenge Allegiance; I believe few will be contented with such an Answer, as refers them only to *Martial Law* for Satisfaction. Thirdly, We have just Exceptions against this Report, if it may be called so, in another respect; and that concerns the Truth of the principal Facts re-

(z) Stow says the same, Chron. p. 422.

(a) *Annals*, p. 418.

(b) John Tiptoft Earl of Worcester, being made Constable of England by Edward 4. played the Part, as it were, of the Butcher in the cruel Execution of divers

*Men of Quality*. Camden's *Britannia*, at the End of Worcester-shire.

(c) *Titles of Honour*, c. 5. p. 654.

(d) Dr. Higden's *Defence of his View*, p. 85. And see Sir Francis Bacon's *Case of the Postnati*, p. 53. in his *Resuscitation*, concerning *Martial Law*.



lated in it. We are told in this Case, that Sir Ralph Grey was actually degraded of the Order of Knighthood, in an ignominious manner; That his gilt Spurs were hewen off his Feet, his Sword and all his Armour broken and taken from him, &c. But in John Stow's Account, which has had the Honour to be credited by Mr. (e) Selden, this Part of the Sentence, which related to Degradation, was pardon'd. It may not be amiss to set down Mr. Stow's Words, that the Reader may the better judge of the Difference between him and the Year-Books.

(e) Titles of Honour, c. 5. p. 654.

(f) Sir Ralph Grey being taken in Bamborough-Castle, for that he had sworn to be true to King Edward, was condemned, and had Judgment given upon him by the Earl of Worcester, High-Constable of England, as followeth.

(f) Stow's Annals, p. 418.

Sir Ralph Grey, for thy Treason the King had ordained, that thou shouldest have had thy Spurs striken off by the hard Heels, by the Hand of the Master-Cook, who is here ready to do, as was promised thee, at the Time that he took off thy Spurs, and said to thee as is accustomed: That and thou be not true to thy Sovereign Lord, he shall smite off thy Spurs with his Knife hard by the Heels; and so shewed him the Master-Cook, ready to do his Office with his Apron and his Knife. Moreover, Sir Ralph Grey, the King had ordeyned here, thou mayest see, the Kings of Arms and Heralds, and thine own proper Coat of Arms which they should tear off thy Body; and so shouldest thou as well be disgraded of thy Worship, Nobles, and Arms, as of thy Order of Knighthood. Also here is another Coat of thy Arms reversed, the which thou shouldest have worn on thy Body, going to thy Deathwards; for that belongeth to thee after the Law: Notwithstanding, the Disgrading of Knighthood, and of thine Arms and Nobles the King pardoneth; for thy Noble Grandfather, who suffer'd Trouble for the King's most Noble Predecessors. Now, Sir Ralph Grey, this shall be thy Penance: Thou shalt go on thy Feet unto the Towns-end, and there thou shalt be laid down, and drawn to a Scaffold made for thee, and thou shalt have thy Head smitten off, thy Body to be buried in the Fryars, thy Head where the King's Pleasure shall be. This Judgment was pronounced at Doncaster against the said Sir Ralph Grey, for rebelling and keeping of the Castle of Bamborough against King Edward.

HERE Mr. Stow has given us the whole and entire Judgment, which was pronounced by the High Constable

ble



ble against Sir Ralph Grey; from whence it is evident, that he was not degraded, neither was his *Doubleness* against Henry VI. any Part of the Sentence against him; which (g) I take to be a strong Presumption at least, against the Authority of this Case.

WE have now done with *Bagot's Case*; but the Doctor has more Observations in reserve from the *Year-Books*, which he fancies do abundantly support his Cause. His next Instances are from the Grants of *Richard III.* which he tells us were allowed, and never controverted in the Courts of *Henry VII.*; and then he proceeds to the Declaration of *Henry VII.'s* Judges, *That the Crown takes away all manner of Defects and Stops in Blood*; of which he seems to be extremely fond; he calls it *Decisive for the Authority of the King in Possession*, and fancies it is impossible to give it a solid Answer. I shall however venture to try the Force of these mighty Arguments in their proper places; and in the mean time shall desire Leave to go through the Reign of King *Edward IV.*, before I take Notice of the Doctor's Evidences from that of *Henry VII.*

THE last Observation the Doctor pretends to make from the *Year-Books* of this Reign is, (h) *That by the Common Law of this Realm Kings de Facto are Legislators, or are vested with the Legislative Authority.* For (says he) in the *Year-Books* of *Edward IV.* the Statutes of the *Lancastrian Kings* are pleaded as Statutes of the Realm, of equal Force and Validity with those made by *Edward IV.* himself. I answer, this may be true, and yet not sufficient for the Doctor's Purpose; for those Statutes of the *Lancastrian Kings*, which were pleaded and allowed in the Courts of *Edward IV.*, were at that very Time voidable by that King; and might have been declared of no Force or Validity, whenever he thought fit; but till such a Declaration was made, the Courts of Justice could not look upon them as actually void. So that their Existence was purely precarious; and they lived wholly by the Permission of *Edward IV.*, not by Virtue of any Authority they derived from the *Lancastrian Kings*. And then the Distin-

(g) This Part of the Sentence is also omitted by Holinhead; for his Words are, That Sir Ralph Grey was Degraded and Beheaded for his manifest Perjury,

for that he had sworn to be true to King Edward; without mentioning any Treason against Henry VI.

(h) View of the Engl. Const. p. 21.



tion between Kings *de Facto* and *de Jure* is beyond Contradiction evident; if the Acts of the former are voidable by the latter, and not, *vice versa*, the Acts of Kings *de Jure* voidable by those *de Facto*. I expect indeed it should be said, that all this is affirm'd without Proof; and I confess it is so: But I must intreat the Reader's Patience for a few Pages, and then I shall be at Leisure to give him Satisfaction in this Point.

IN the next place the Doctor (i) assures us, That not only the Courts of *Edward IV.*, but he himself in his Acts of Parliament, had own'd the *Lancastrian* Kings to be *Legislators*, and their *Laws* to be of equal Force and Authority with the *Laws* of any of his Ancestors, or with his own. And his Way of proving this is as follows: The 14th of *Edward IV.*, cap. 2. recites at large a Statute made the 9th of *Henry V.*, for the Protection of all Persons, that should go with the said King into France, or were there in his Service, from being Non-suited at the *Affizes*, &c. whilst they were absent; which Act was to continue till the first Parliament after the King's Return into England. After this Recital King *Edward IV.* and his Parliament enact, That the same Order and Protection shall be observ'd, and be as available for all manner of Persons, that should pass into France with him, as it was for such Persons, as did pass over the Sea with the said late King *Henry V.*: And that all such Persons, as shall now pass over the Sea with our Sovereign Lord the King, shall have and enjoy in every Point, all manner of Advantages, as the said Persons so passing over the Seas with the said late King had by this said Statute. Here we see (says the Doctor) that *Edward IV.* declares the Validity of that Statute, during the Time for which it was made, to be equal to this made by himself; and challenges no more Authority for his own Law, than he acknowledges that had.

THIS is the only Instance, it seems, he could meet with among *Edward IV.*'s Acts of Parliament; and now the Wonder is, what Service it will do him. *Edward IV.* says, That an Act made by *Henry V.* was available to all the Purposes intended by it; which was undoubtedly true; for all those that pass'd over the Sea with *Henry V.* did certainly enjoy great Advantages from this Statute. But the Doctor will have it, that *Edward IV.* does in Effect declare, that Statute was valid during the Time for which it was made; very right, if he



means only, that it was *de Facto* valid, as it was obeyed; but if he would infer from it, that therefore *Henry V.* was a King *de Jure*; he must pardon me, if I cannot be of his Opinion; for I cannot easily persuade myself, that *Edward IV.* who treats his Predecessors of the House of *Lancaster* with the odious Name of *Usurpers*; styles them *pretensed Kings*, and would not allow their *Judicial Proceedings* to be good without Confirmation; who declares even their *Acts of Parliament pretensed Acts*, and vacates several of them expressly for Want of Authority in the Makers of them; as will appear fully in the Sequel of this Discourse; and *Lastly*, who in this very Act, we are speaking of, calls *Henry V.* King *de Facto*, and not *de Jure*; could ever intend, the World should believe, he thought that Prince had a *Legislative Capacity*. The Doctor may flatter himself as he pleases, that these are no Contradictions; but I must beg Leave to indulge myself in my Persuasion, that no candid Reader, who seriously examines the Importance of these Expressions, and diligently observes the Style of those Acts, which passed against the Title and Government of the House of *Lancaster*, will allow it to be possible, that the Passage now in question can fairly be understood in the Doctor's Sense. But I need not give myself the Trouble of a nice Examination of every thing he may think proper to say upon this Argument; since all that can possibly be urged, will be effectually answer'd by a View of the Proceedings of *Edward IV.*'s Parliaments; by which it will appear, that all the *Acts* of the Three *Henrys* were held to be defective in Point of Authority: And then certainly those Princes could not have a *Legislative Capacity*, who had none at all.

I SAY, all the *Acts* of the Three *Henrys* were held to be defective in *Point of Authority*, in *Edward IV.*'s Reign. Now their *Acts* were either such, as were *done out of Parliament*, or in it. That those that were done out of Parliament, were not look'd upon as valid, is evident from the Confirmation of them by (k) *Edward IV.* For why were they confirmed, if they did not need it? If their Authority was not at least questionable, and liable to be disputed without it? The Doctor may here tell us, if he pleases, that a *Confirmation* does not always imply a Want of Authority in that which receives it; because

(k) 1 Edw. 4.



because *Magna Charta* was confirm'd several times : But surely that could not be the Meaning of the Parliament in the present Case ; for the *Preamble of the Act* assures us, that the *Confirmation* there granted was in *eschewing of Ambiguities, Doubts, and Diversities of Opinions, which might rise, ensue, and be taken of Judicial Acts, &c.* But those Doubts and Ambiguities could only happen upon account of the Power, from whence they proceeded ; for upon the *Confirmation* of them it is added, *That they shall be of like Force, Virtue, and Effect, as if they had been done in the Time of any King lawfully reigning, &c.* an undeniable Proof, that it was the Want of Authority in the Prince only, which was the Reason of their *Confirmation*. Besides, we shall find presently, that some of the *Acts of Parliament* of the Three *Henrys*, became void purely upon King *Edward's* refusing to *confirm* them : And then surely it will be granted, that their *Acts* of less Moment and Authority, stood much more in need of a Ratification from the King *de Jure*. And Lastly, if the Doctor should insist upon it, that the *Confirmation* given by *Edward IV.* added nothing to the Validity of those *Acts*, for the Benefit of which it was intended ; may it not be with as much Reason affirm'd, that the (1) *Confirmation* granted to the *Judicial Acts, &c.* of the *Commonwealth* and *Oliver Cromwell*, was equally unnecessary ? I shall presume therefore to believe it to be an undoubted Truth, that the *Confirmation* allow'd to the *Acts* of the Three *Henrys* did imply, that they were not of sufficient Authority without it. (m) And if this is really the Case, this alone discovers such a Defect of Power in Kings *de Facto*, even tho' their *Acts* of *Parliament* should be allow'd to be good, as will sufficiently vindicate those, who distinguish them from Kings *de Jure* : For if we take a particular View of the several *Extra-Parliamentary Acts*, which only became valid by

(1) 12 Car. 2. 12.

(m) For a full and undeniable Proof, that the *Extra-Parliamentary Acts* of the Three *Henrys* became of no Authority upon *Edward IV.'s Accession* to the Crown, the following Passage is very remarkable. Among the Provisoes to the *Act of Resumption*, 1 *Edward IV.* is this that follows. Rot. Parl. 1 *Edw. IV.* Provided alway, that this *Act* extend not, ne in any wise be prejudicial of any Grant made by us to *Richard Arthur Esq;* of the Ward of

Land and of the Body with the Marriage of *John Kenn* Son and Heir to *Robert Kenn* by our Letters Patents sith the Time of our Reign. And that all Grants made by *Henry VI.* late King in Deed and not of Right, to *James* late Earl of *Wiltshire*, or to any other Person or Persons, of the said Ward and Marriage, be of such Force and Effect, as they were the first Day of our Noble Reign, and no better.



the Confirmation of *Edward IV*; we shall perceive, that as they were many in Number, and various in their Kinds; so they were all Essential to the very Being of Government; which cannot possibly subsist, where a Power of performing them is Wanting. Let the Reader only be pleas'd to try the Experiment, and see whether he can form any other Idea of a King *de Facto*, from the Statute which confirms the *Judicial Acts*, &c. of the Three *Henrys*, than this which follows.

HE is a Person that is not legally qualified to give a Commission to Judges, neither are the Proceedings in his Courts of Judicature (n) of any Authority. He cannot (o) create a Nobleman, or (p) make a Bishop; and whatever Liberties, Privileges, and Immunities, &c. he grants to Cities and Corporations, they are of no Validity. His Licenses of Mortmain, and Presentations to Benefices, are voidable; and even his Grants of Wards and Marriages, Fairs and Markets, are revokable at the Will and Pleasure of the King *de Jure*. He (q) can neither give a Pension nor a Corrody; and especially all Lands bestowed by him, are resumable, whenever his Rightful Successor is pleased to make use of his Authority. More Instances might be observed in the printed Acts and Rolls of Parliament, besides what I have here recited; which would abundantly prove, that the Authority of Kings *de Facto*, as asserted by the Doctor, was a Secret in our Constitution not then discover'd; for had that been an uncontested Doctrine, these Acts of Kings *de Facto* had never received, nor needed a Confirmation: And it will not now be thought strange, if what the (r) Doctor had before affirm'd, should be true, viz. That the Grants, Licenses, Letters Patent, Gifts, &c. of the Three *Henrys*, are pleaded and allowed in all the Judicial Proceedings of *Edward IV.*'s Courts of Judicature to be valid, &c. for it is plain they were confirm'd by *Edward IV.*, and thereby acquired an effectual Force against all Opposers of their Authority;

(n) My Lord Chief Justice Coke says, Treason lies only against a King *de Facto*; but we find Judgments for Treason, given in the Courts of the Kings of the House of Lancaster, confirm'd, 1 *Edw. 4.*

(o) It is fit here to observe, that though King *Edward*, at the Request of his Commons, did confirm all Titles of Honour, conferred by the Kings of the House of

Lancaster; yet the Record assures us (*Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4. f. A.*) that he did it upon this Condition, that the said Noblemen should have new Grants from him, of their Annuities for the Sustentation of their Estates.

(p) *Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4.*

(q) *Ibid.*

(r) *View*, p. 13.



but then it must be confess'd, they owed their Validity to that Prince, not to the Three *Henrys*. So that whatever may be the Power of Kings *de Facto* in Parliament, it is clear from the above-mentioned Instances, that they have so little out of it, that the common Ends of Government are not attainable under them.

BUT the Doctor is confident, the Acts of Parliament of the Three *Henrys* stand upon a sure Foundation; for he (s) tells us, *they have been always held valid, though never confirmed*; and therefore (says (t) he) *when that which is the highest Act of Government is valid, none of the rest of their Regal Acts can reasonably be disputed*. Upon this Occasion the Doctor will pardon me, if I put him in mind of a (u) Complaint he has made against his Adversaries, that they did not duly consider, that all his Arguments are built upon *Matters of Fact, which can only be answer'd by denying them*. Here therefore he plainly transgresses his own Rule, by arguing against *Matter of Fact*; for he very well knew, that all the other *Royal Acts of the Three Henrys* were not held to be valid, as the *Confirmation* of them manifestly implied; and this was worse than *disputing* them; for it was putting their Want of Authority out of *Dispute*. Besides, was not their *Authority disputed* in *Bagot's Case*? Was not the *Validity of Henry VI.'s Letters Patent* the Point, that was chiefly controverted? Certainly this is a Truth the Doctor himself will not dispute; and if I mistake not, it deserves his particular Notice, that this *Dispute* lasted several Terms, and took up at least two Years before it was ended; so *unreasonable* were the Lawyers of those Times, and so ignorant the Judges, of the *Constitution*. Since therefore the Matter is really thus, as I have represented it; since likewise it is a Rule not to be dispensed with in Enquiries after Truth, that doubtful Propositions are to be examin'd by those that are evident and certain, and the contrary is indeed impracticable; why should we not rather infer, from the *Confirmation*, which we are sure was granted to many of the *Regal Acts* of the Three *Henrys*, that the rest also wanted it; than affirm with the Doctor, (without sufficient Warrant and Authority) that the *Acts of Parliament* of those Kings were held good without *Confirmation*, and therefore that all their other Acts ought to have been esteem'd so too? I am sensible, I am now upon a Point, which deserves well



to be consider'd; and I should deceive my Reader's Expectation, if I did not explain myself fully upon it. I say therefore, that the Doctor has (x) affirmed, without sufficient Warrant and Authority, that the Acts of Parliament of the Three *Henrys* were held good without *Confirmation*: And I will presume to add, that he here again violates that Respect, which he professes to be due to *Fact*. For,

*First*, It evidently appears from some Instances upon (y) Record, that *Confirmation* was denied to some Acts of Parliament of the Three *Henrys*; and that the Effect of that Denial was, that they were esteemed of no Authority. Thus, among other Petitions, the Commons pray, *That all Acts of Parliament, afore this Time made, for Payment and Contentation of Fees, Rewards, and Cloathing of your Justices, Barons of your Exchequer, Serjeants at Law, Attorney, &c. be good and in Force.* To this the King answers; *As to this Article, it is thought necessary, that they be truly paid; but not to affirm their Assignment of Payment and Contentation by Authority of Parliament; but that it be at the King's Pleasure.* Here we see an Act of Parliament loses its Force only for want of *Confirmation*; the bare Denial of which, in that publick Manner, was equivalent to annulling, or declaring it void. Another Instance is this which follows, and that, I think, not a little remarkable.

ITEM, (z) *Prayen your Commons, that all Acts made by Authority of eny Parliaments, holden in the Time of the pretended Reigns of eny of the said late Pretended Kings, for Contentation or Payment of eny other Sum or Sums of Money, due unto the Mayor and Fellowship of Merchants of the Staple of Caley, for the Time being; for Money lent by them to eny of the said late Pretended Kings, or for Payment of Wages of the Captain and Souldiers of the Town of Caley, and the Marches there; be in their Force and Effect, and available to the Fellowship and Merchants of the said Staple now being, and to their Successours, for Contentation and Payment of the said Sums of Money yet remaining due and unpaid to them, speci-*

(x) *The Doctor says it again in his Preface to his Defence; All the Publick Statutes which were made by Kings de Facto, have ever had the Force of Laws of this Realm, &c. without any Con-*

*firmation, or pretended Confirmation; and have been recited as such by Kings de Jure, and their Parliaments.*

(y) Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4.

(z) Ibid.



*fied in any of the said Acts of Parliament, &c.* But the King's Answer was, *This Article is respited*; and if I remember rightly, it (a) was not till four Years after, that the *Rolls of Parliament* tells us, there was any Provision made to secure the Payment of those Debts. So that here is a *National Debt*, contracted upon *Parliament Security*, (very probably for the Carrying on a War against France, as well as for the Payment of the Garrison of Calais) in Danger of being entirely defeated, had not King Edward at last, by his *Royal Assent*, entitled it to a Legal Payment. What will the Doctor now say to this? Will he persuade us, that these were no Acts of a publick Nature? Or rather, may we not hope, that he will retract the following Passages, which, it is to be fear'd, have had too much Credit with many of his Readers? No body, says the (b) Doctor, has been able to produce one single Act, of all the numerous Acts that were made by the Three Kings of the House of Lancaster, that was esteem'd to want the Confirmation of Edward IV; for without it they were held to be of as good Authority, as his own Acts. And again; I have shewed, that there was not one of the numerous Publick Acts, that were made in the Reigns of the Three Henrys, ever confirm'd; and yet stood, and (except such of them as have been repealed) do stand in Force at this Day. These Expressions are strong and peremptory; and would indeed answer the Doctor's End, if there were any Truth in them; in which respect I must have Leave to say, they are now visibly defective. The Reader will undoubtedly observe, that the Instances I have here recited, of Acts of Parliament of the Three Henrys, which became void by being denied a Confirmation, are not to be found in the printed Act of Parliament of the first of Edward IV. And true it is, that they are there omitted, as well as some other Matters, very worthy of Regard in this Controversy; but he will meet with them in the *Rolls of Parliament*, which I presume will be as much to his Satisfaction. And now, though I do not pretend to produce any more Instances of Acts of Parliament, which became void by being denied Confirmation; I would however ask, whether these Two are not sufficient for my Purpose? If they had an original complete Authority before Edward IV.'s Time, I would fain know, how they came to need his Confirmation. And if they did not need

(a) Rot. Parl.  
4 Edw. 4.  
f. 44.

(b) Defence,  
p. 70, and 86.



need his *Confirmation*, it would be a great Favour to inform me, how they became void by the Refusal of it. With the Reader's Permission, I would carry these Queries a little farther: Did not the Manner of voiding these Acts of Parliament plainly denote a Defect of Authority in those that made them? And might not the same Defect of Authority be objected against every *Act of Parliament* made by the Three *Henrys*, as well as these Two? The Doctor perhaps will ask, how then came any of the *Acts* of those Kings to be good, which do not appear to have been confirmed? But this is a Question I am not bound to answer; it is enough for my Purpose, if I can shew, they were not good without the Approbation of the King *de Jure*; and that I think I have effectually done; and need not be solicitous, from whence they derived their Validity, provided they did not owe it to Kings *de Facto*. The Doctor may gratify his Curiosity, if he pleases, with such Enquiries; but for my part, I have Reason to be contented with the sole Discovery, that the *Confirmation* granted to the Laws of the Three *Henrys* was purely, because they were made by Kings *de Facto*; and none were annulled, or became void, but for the same Reason; for this is as good, as Ten Thousand Arguments, to demonstrate, that the Parliaments of *Edward IV.* did not own the *Legislative Authority* of his Three *Predecessors*; which is the Point now in Question between the Doctor and me. I might urge farther, that if the *Acts* of Parliament of Kings *de Facto*, that were of greatest Moment, were not of Force without the *Confirmation* of the King *de Jure*; then certainly the Invalidity of the rest of their *Acts*, which were of less Consequence, *could not reasonably be disputed*: That is, since it is evident, that the Security given by the Parliaments of the Three *Henrys* for Money borrowed for the Publick Service, (a Matter certainly of the utmost Concern in all Governments) was insufficient; it will follow, that all their other *Acts of Parliament*, could not be esteemed of good Authority.

Secondly, I say again, that it is without sufficient Warrant, that the Doctor affirms, *That all the Acts of Parliament of the Three Henrys were good, though not confirm'd*; because it is manifest, some of them were declared void; which would not have been done, (according



ding to the constant Practice and Usage of Parliaments) if they had been good; for no *Act* can be declared void, but what was defective in some respect before; but no other Defect can be assign'd, as a Reason for such a Declaration, in the present Case, but only that of Authority in the pretended *Legislators*. Now it appears evidently from the *Rolls of Parliament*, (c) that all *Statutes, Acts, and Ordinances, made in and for the Hurt, Destruction, and Avoiding of the Right and Title of King Richard, or of his Heirs, to ask, cleyme, or have the Crown Royal, Power, Estate, Dignite, Præeminence, Governance, Exercise, Possessions, and Lordships, &c. are ordained, declared, and established to be void, and be taken, holden, and reputed void, and for nought, adnulled, repealed, revoked, and of no Force, Value, or Effect, &c.* For this Clause being declaratory, does not only imply, that they were not to be of any Force for the future; but also, that they wanted it before. And this cannot be doubted by those, that will give themselves the Trouble of perusing the whole *Act*; in which it is affirmed, *That the Right and Title of the Crown of England, after the Decease of King Richard II, by Law, Custom, and Conscience, descended to Edmund Earl of March; and that Faith and Ligeance was due to him; and also Richard Duke of York is said, in his Life, to have been very King, in Right, of the Realm of England.* Which Expressions could not possibly have been used, if they had not look'd upon those *Acts of Henry IV*, by which he endeavour'd to secure the Succession of the Crown to his Issue and Family, as ineffectual for the Purposes they were intended. And thus, when *Henry VI*. regain'd the Crown, and by forcing *Edward IV*. out of the Kingdom, was fully possessed of every Part of it; what he did in Parliament, during that Interval, was entirely vacated by the said *Edward*: The *Act of Parliament*, by which this Annulation was declared, is worthy of the Doctor's serious Consideration; and therefore I shall transcribe it for his Use.

(d) *Whereas in the most dolorous Absence of our Sovereign Lord the King out of this Realm, being in the Parts of Hol-* land, and before his victorious Regress into the same Realm; in a pretended Parliament, unlawfully and by usurped Power summon'd by the Rebel and Enemy to our Sovereign Lord the King, *Henry VI*, late in Deed and not of Right King of

(c) Rot. Parl.  
1 Edw. 4.

4-7.



England, holden in the Palace of Westminster the Twenty Sixth Day of November, in the Ninth Year of our Sovereign Lord the King that now is, under the coloured Title of the said Henry, the Forty Ninth Year of the Inchoation of his pretended Reign, and the First Year of the Readeption of his Usurped Power and Estate, divers and many Matters were treated, communed, wrought, to the Destruction and Disherrison of our Sovereign Lord the King, and of his Blood Royal, by the Labour and Exhortation of Persons not fearing GOD, nor willing to be under the Rule of any Earthly Prince, but inclined, of sensual Appetite, to have the whole Governace and Rule of this Realm under their Power and Domination: Which Communication, Treates, and Workyngs, doth remain in Writing, and some exemplified, whereby many Inconveniencies may ensue to our Sovereign Lord the King, and his Blood Royal, which GOD defend, and all Noblemen at this time attending about the King, and all his other Liege People and Subjects, ones due Remedy be provided in this Behalf. Our said Sovereign Lord the King, by the Assent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and at the Request of the Commons in the said Parliament assembled, and by Authority of the same, for the Surety of his Noble Person, his Noble Issue, and the Inheritable Succession of the same, and for the Surety of all the Lords, Noblemen, and other his Servants and Subjects, hath ordained and established, that the said pretended Parliament, with all the Continuances and Circumstances depending upon the same, be void and of none Effect. And that all Acts, Statutes, Ordynances, Treates, Communications, Conventions, and Workyngs in the said pretended Parliament treatyed, communed, &c. and all Exemplifications made upon the same, or any Part of them, and every of them, shall be reversed, cancelled, void, undone, revoked, repealed, and of no Force nor Effect.

(e) *View*,  
P. 37.

THE Doctor is indeed (e) positive, that the Authority of those Laws, which Henry VI. made on his Readeption of the Regal Dignity, had been own'd, if they had not been repeal'd by Edward IV. for these Statutes (as he is pleased to affirm) made in the Forty Ninth Year of Henry VI, did not sink of themselves, as some have imagined, and urged for an Argument; but were repealed and reversed, as my Lord Chief Justice Coke says; for Edward IV.'s Act doth not declare them void, but ordain and establish them to be void. A very acute



acute and judicious Observation! For then it seems (f) King *Edward IV.*'s Friends stood all this while attainted, his Issue excluded the Succession, and his Laws repealed, till the Time of passing the Act, which was the Space of eight Years; for so long it was, before he thought fit to annull the Proceedings of *Henry VI.* in his *pretensed Parliament*. Now it must be observed, that *Edward IV.* held a Parliament in the Twelfth Year of his Reign, and another in the Seventeenth, (when the Act we are now speaking of pass'd) in which no *attainted* Person could possibly sit; and consequently, during all this Space of Time, the Acts of Parliament made by *Henry VI.*, being in full Force, according to the Doctor's Assertion, *Edward IV.*'s best Friends were incapacitated for Sitting in Parliament: The Doctor may believe this if he pleases; but I must desire to be excused. The true Reason undoubtedly, why at last it was thought fit to annull the Proceedings of that Parliament of *Henry VI.*, was out of a prudent Regard to the Uncertainty of Humane Affairs, of which that Age was abundantly convinced. Another Revolution might happen, when the Friends to the *Lancastrian* Family would have it in their Power to revenge themselves upon their Enemies; and then those Acts of *Attainder*, which had not been reversed, might be put in Execution: And besides, *Henry VI.*, in this last Parliament, had again entail'd the Succession of the Crown upon his own Issue; and (which might be judged a Matter of no small Concern) upon the Failure of it, had settled it upon the (g) Duke of *Clarence* and his Children. Now considering the Temper of that (h) Duke, and the Mutability of those Times, it might be thought dangerous to suffer that Act (tho' made in a *pretensed Parliament*, *unlawfully* and by *usurped Power* summon'd by that Rebel and Enemy to King *Edward IV.*, *Henry VI.*, late in Deed and not of Right King of England) to continue *unrepealed*. I make use of that Word, because I think I may do it without any Prejudice to my Opinion; for though the Doctor seems persuaded, that whatever Acts are *repealed*, must needs be of Force till they are so; I cannot allow this to be always true; of which I have just now given an Instance, in the Acts of *Henry IV.*, which were declared Null and Void in the First Parliament of *Edward IV.*; and yet in that

(f) Holinf-  
head's Chron:  
10 Edw. 4.

(g) Ibid.

(h) He died  
that Year.

very



very Statute they are said to be *repealed* too. It is true, the Acts of *Henry VI.* are not *declared void* in this of *Edward IV.* in express Terms; which Omission the Doctor thinks remarkable for his Purpose; but the Words made use of are certainly of equal Importance; for they are *ordained and established to be void*, which undoubtedly is equivalent to *declaring* them so. In a word, if the Laws made by *Henry VI.* before his Dispossession, were not held of sufficient Force and Authority, as I have proved by some Instances; it must be very strange, if those made by him upon his Recovery of the Crown, should be good and valid. Or, which is much the same thing, if *Edward IV.* could lawfully declare all the Acts of Parliament of *Henry VI.* null and void, which were made by him the first Thirty Nine Years of his Reign; it would be strange if any should maintain, that his subsequent Laws were of better Authority.

(i) *View,*  
P. 49.

I SHALL now proceed farther in my Enquiries into the Truth of the Doctor's Position, *That none of the Acts of Parliament of the Three Henrys were confirm'd by Edward IV.* The (i) Doctor confesses, *that some Acts of Parliament relating to the Town of Shrewsbury, and to the Founding some Religious Houses, were confirmed by Edw. IV.*; but then he says, *this was probably through Caution, and at the Desire of those that were concerned in them*: I readily agree with him in this Point; but the Question is, whether this Caution was not necessary; and whether the Validity of these Acts, for which this Confirmation was desired, might not have been controverted without it. Confirmations of this Nature do not use to be desired, or granted, but upon real, not imaginary Occasions; and therefore if Conjectures were to be admitted in this Case, they ought rather to be in Favour of the former, than the latter; especially considering the Intention of the Act, in which these Confirmations were made. The Preamble says, it was to *prevent Ambiguities, Doubts, and Diversities of Opinions about the Validity of Acts of Parliament*; and therefore the Doctor must give me Leave to infer, that this Confirmation was no unnecessary thing. Besides, allowing this Caution to have been *needless*, yet even this is an Argument against the Doctor's Hypothesis; for if the *Legislative Authority* of Kings *de Facto* was an undeniable Part of the Constitution, which had been always universally



fully acknowledged, and never disputed; how came Doubts to arise on a sudden, in Peoples Heads, about the Validity of the Acts of the Three *Henrys*? What Reason was there, why any Subject should put himself to the Charge and Trouble of soliciting an Act of Parliament to secure a Title, that had never been called in Question? And this will be thought the more strange, when it is observ'd, that tho' the Doctor calls these Acts which were confirm'd, *Acts of a Private Nature*; yet they were such, as Multitudes of Persons were concerned in: All the Inhabitants of the Town of *Shrewsbury*, and all those that derived any Benefit from the *Religious Houses* founded by the House of *Lancaster*, whose Number could not be small and inconsiderable. Surely it would be very surprizing and unaccountable, to find People *so much afraid, where no Fear was*, if it had not been a prevailing Opinion in those Times, that the Acts of Kings *de Facto* needed *Confirmation*; but such an Opinion could never have obtain'd so powerful an Influence, had the *Constitution* been such, as the Doctor represents it. To all this let me add, that it was at the Desire, not only of those that were immediately concern'd, that these Acts were confirm'd; but also of the *House of Commons* too; for all *Acts of Parliament*, in those Days, were in their first Formations only Petitions of the *Commons*, who could not be supposed capable of making that any Part of them, which never had a Precedent to countenance it; and if the Doctor's Opinion be true, wanted even the least Appearance of Reason to justify and support it. To conclude therefore, should we allow it to be true, that these were the only Acts of the Three *Henrys*, that were confirm'd by *Edward IV*; yet this *Confirmation* is a Proof, that those Acts were not thought of sufficient Authority without it. And then I may ask the Doctor to give one single Instance out of all our Records, of any Act of Parliament made by a Rightful King, that ever was confirm'd for Want of sufficient Authority. This Question was put to the Doctor with great Assurance, as he is pleas'd to say; but I am persuaded, with as much Judgment: And it is worth while to observe, how the (k) Doctor answers (k) Defence, it. The Acts (says he) of the 12th of Charles II. were confirm'd in the 13th of Charles II; and this, he tells us, is an Instance for him, and a famous one. Well! if the Doctor



only may speak with *Assurance*, who can help it? But I hope, without Breach of Modesty, we may ask what he meant by this Answer; and how it was to his Purpose. The Question was, Whether Acts made in a Legal Parliament by a Rightful King, were ever *confirm'd*, by Reason of a Defect of that King's Authority: The Doctor says, Yes; because King *Charles II.* *confirm'd* the Acts made in the *Convention*; this is wonderful: For the Doctor knows very well, that those Acts were not *confirm'd* for want of Authority in King *Charles II.*, when they were made; but for want of Authority in that *Convention*, or *Parliament*, upon the account of its not being called by the King's Writ. The Doctor is too well acquainted with our *Constitution*, to be ignorant, that there are certain Essential Forms to be observed in the *Summoning*, *Electing*, and *Constituting* Legal *Parliaments*, by the Omision of which their Proceedings will be questionable at least, if not void; and this may undoubtedly (1) happen under Kings *de Jure*: But how is this applicable to the Case of *Henry VI.*, whose Acts were *confirm'd* only upon the Account of a Defect in his Authority, and not upon any Suspicion of Irregularity in the Assembling of his Parliament? Well, but the Doctor asks, how it came to pass, that there were no more Acts of Parliament of the Three *Henrys* *confirm'd*, if they were not of sufficient Force without it? I answer; That it is very probable, that *many* more were *confirm'd*, than those the Doctor mentions; but that *some* more were *confirm'd*, is certain and undeniable.

(1) 39 Hen.  
6. c. 1.

First, I say, it is very probable, that *many* more were *confirm'd*, than those mentioned by the Doctor. For when *Richard* Duke of York laid Claim to the Crown, he granted and agreed, that all other *Acts and Ordinances of Parliament* (besides those that concern'd the Inheritance of the Crown) (m) *should be good and sufficient against all other Persons*: This Concession prevented many Inconveniencies of a Change. And *Edward IV.* was obliged by the Interest of his Government, and by this Precedent by his Father, the first Claimer, to approve of the Concession. Besides, the same Concern for the Publick Good and Welfare, which prevail'd with King *Edward* to confirm the *Judicial Acts*, &c. of the Three *Henrys*, done out of Parliament, would necessarily oblige him to do as much

(m) Rot.  
Parl. 39 Hen.  
6. n. 15.

for



for many of their *Acts of Parliament*, which manifestly provided for the general Benefit and Advantage of his People. It is true, the *Act* which confirms the *Judicial Proceedings*, &c. of those Princes, seems plainly to (n) except their *Acts of Parliament* from that *Confirmation*; but even that Exception overthrows the Doctor's Assertion; for if it was a certain and unquestionable Truth, (as he would make us believe) that those *Acts* wanted no *Confirmation*; it was impertinent to tell the World, it was not intended them: And it is not easy to conceive, such an Instance can be produced of *Acts of Parliament*, the Authority of which was indisputable, that were particularly excepted out of an *Act of Confirmation* for no other Reason, but only because they did not need any. It is very probable therefore, that King *Edward* took care to intimate his Pleasure, that all those *Acts* of his *de Facto* Predecessors, which were thought of publick Use and Service, should still be put in Execution, notwithstanding we do not meet with any express *Act* of Parliament, by which they were purposely and formally confirm'd; and the true Reason, why only those particular *Acts*, which concern'd the Foundation of *Religious Houses*, and the Town of *Shrewsbury*, were mention'd, seems to have been, rather to secure them from the *Act of Resumption*, which had passed just before in this Session of Parliament, than to supply the Defect of Authority in the Kings of the House of *Lancaster*: For by this *Act of Resumption*, all *Lands, Rights, and Powers*, being restored to the Crown, which had been granted away by the Three *Henrys*; the very Sites of Religious Houses founded by them were resumable, without a particular Exception; and upon the same Account the Town of *Shrewsbury* stood in need of particular Favour, for the Preservation of those Privileges, which had been conferr'd upon it by the Bounty of those Kings.

BUT, Secondly, It is certain some other *Acts of Parliament* of those Princes of the House of *Lancaster*, were confirm'd by *Edward IV.*, besides those mentioned by the Doctor: As an (o) *Act* for the *Cloathing*, &c. of the Judges, (p) and the Letters Patent of *Henry VI.* to *Jacquette of Luxemburgh*, Duchess of *Bedford*, granted in Parliament, are also confirm'd. All Commissions of *Sewers*, for which they had the Authority of *Acts of Parliament* made by Hen-

(n) Stat.  
1 Edw. 4.  
All Judicial  
Acts made in  
any Court or  
Courts, &c.  
(other than  
by Authority  
of any Par-  
liament hol-  
den in any of  
their Times.)

(o) Rot. Parl.  
1 Edw. 4.  
(p) Ibid.



ry VI, are likewise declared (q) Good; which plainly shewed, that those *Acts* were not held of sufficient Force, to warrant the Proceedings of the Commissioners. And Lastly, several *Acts of Parliament* made by Henry VI. against the *Breakers of Leagues*, &c. with Foreign Princes, are (r) expressly confirm'd; but at the same time it is declared, that the said *Confirmation* shall not extend to the second of Henry V, VI; which affords us another remarkable Instance of an Act of Parliament made by a King *de Facto*, which became void by the King *de Jure's* bare Refusal to confirm it. I doubt not however, but it will be still ask'd, Why don't we find more Acts of Parliament of the Three *Henrys* confirm'd, if it was necessary? How comes it to pass, that so many of their Laws have been executed ever since their Reigns, without any Appearance of a Ratification from their Lawful Successor? If they did not receive their Authority from the Makers of them, from whence did they derive it? Now, if this Objection signifies any thing, it will prove as well, that Laws may be made without Bishops, without a House of Commons, without the Concurrence of the *Three Estates*, and even of the King himself; for Instances may be easily given of *Acts and Ordinances*, which have had the Force of Laws in *England*, which were defective upon one or other of those Accounts. Thus Mr. Prynne (s) tells us, That several *Acts* are printed in the *Statute Book*, as *Acts of Parliament*, which had no Authority. And my Lord (t) *Ellesmere* has mention'd several *Proclamations*, which had the Force of Laws. It has likewise been (u) acknowledged, that many *Constitutions*, which were originally enacted by a *Foreign Authority*, (as some *Papal* and *Legantine Constitutions*) are binding in *England*, by Virtue of the *Royal Sufferance*, and the free Consent of the People; yet surely it does not from thence follow, that the Pope had any Authority to impose them. But this will appear more evident by the following Observations. (x) A Learned Author has assured us, that some Ordinances of

(q) 1 Edw. 4. 1.

(r) 14 Edw. 4. 4.

(s) Prynne's Pref. to his Register of Parl. Writs in the Beginning.

(t) In his Speech about the Post Nati.

(u) 25 Hen. 8. c. 21.

(x) Præfat. D. Gale ad 15 Scriptores. Mirum dictu; Simon Montfortius leges aliquot rogavit; Henricus tertius pessimis usus consiliis non assensit, inde bellum civile &amp; proscriptiones. Et tamen, quis crederet? Illis ipsis Montfortii nefarii placitis obsequium perfolvimus.



*Simon Montfort* had as much the Force of Laws; as if they had been made by King *Henry III.* And tho' it is an establish'd Truth, that the Assent of the Commons is absolutely necessary in making Laws, and without it nothing can deserve the Name of an Act of Parliament; yet my Lord Chief Justice (y) *Coke* assures us, That the 5th of *Richard II.* concerning Heresy, tho' protested against by the Commons, was put in execution, and continued to be observed as a Law, till it was repealed by *Edward VI.* (z) and Queen *Elizabeth.* The same thing is (a) affirmed by Mr. *Fox*, of the 2<sup>d</sup> of *Henry IV.* c. 15. That the Commons never gave their Consent to it; and my Lord Chief Justice (b) *Coke* concurs with him in his Opinion of this Statute, and likewise of the 2<sup>d</sup> of *Henry V.* c. 7. The Force of which Acts was felt by the Subjects, till *Henry VIII.*'s and *Edward VI.*'s Reigns; and afterwards in that of Queen *Mary*, till their final Repeal by Queen *Elizabeth.*

I MAY now ask the Doctor the same Question he puts to his Adversaries, (*Defence*, p. 62.) what sort of Laws these were. Will he say they were Statute Laws? That could not be, for they were not enacted in a Parliamentary Way. Were they Common Laws? That was also impossible at the Time when they were first put in execution. When he answers these Questions, his Adversaries will be able to tell him, what sort of Laws those of the Three *Henrys* were. Customs, he says, (*View*, p. 24.) are sometimes by Acts of Parliament turn'd into Statute Law; but Statutes can never be turn'd into Common Laws or Custom. But therein he neither speaks Accurately, nor according to Truth: For, First, Tho' Statutes are sometimes made in Affirmance of Common Law; yet Common Law is not thereby turn'd into Statute; for then it would cease to be Common Law. Secondly, It is not true, that Statutes can never be turn'd into Common Law; for my Lord Chief Justice *Hale*\* has given it under his Hand, That many of those things, that now obtain as Common Law, had their Original Parliamentary Acts or Constitutions, made in Writing by the King, Lords, and Commons; tho' those Acts are now either

(y) 3<sup>d</sup> Inst. c. Heresy; and 4<sup>th</sup> Inst. ch. H. Court of Parl. and Sir Roger Twissden's Vind. of the Church of England.

(z) 1 Edw. 6. c. 12. 1 Eliz. c. 1.

(A) Acts and Mon. p. 586. in Hen. 5. and p. 556. in Hen. 4.

(b) 4<sup>th</sup> Inst. ch. 1. of the Parliament.

\* Hist. of the Common Law, ch. 1. p. 3.



not extant, or if extant, were made before Time of Memory, &c.

I SHALL only beg Leave to mention one Instance more of this Nature, which alone might be sufficient to shew, that the Validity of Laws does not always depend upon the Authority of the first Makers of them; or (that I may express myself with the utmost Clearness) that the Commands of Persons not legally qualified to give them, may be observ'd and obeyed, as equal in Authority to the most Sacred Laws of the Kingdom.

(c) W. Prynn's 4th Part of a Register, &c. of Parliament Writs. Sect. 5. P. 449, 450, &c.

(d) Prynn, ibid.

(e) Prynn, ibid.

(c) KING Richard II. being forced to yield to the Violence of the Times, issues out his Writs for a Parliament to meet on the 30th of September, the 23d Year of his Reign; on which Day he resign'd up his Crown; and the Duke of Lancaster took Possession of it, by the Name of King Henry IV; and thereby that Parliament was actually Dissolv'd, the very first Day it met, as the Parliament Roll of Henry IV. declares. (d) Henry IV. being thus declared King, does upon that very 30th of September issue out his Writs, in his own Name, for a new Parliament, to be held at Westminster on St. Faith the Virgin's Festival, the 6th of October then next following. (e) Now there being only Six Days Space between the Teste of these Writs, and the Day of the Parliament, it was impossible to make any new Elections of Knights, Citizens, and Burgeses, throughout England, in so short a Space; upon which Account, the Knights and Burgeses sent to the Parliament summon'd by King Richard, were continued, and forthwith return'd for this, as if they had been newly elected, by Virtue of this New King's Writs. This is Mr. Prynn's Account of this Parliament, which I am persuaded will be found true upon Examination; and if we consider farther, that King Richard was a Prisoner at the Time, when he sign'd his Writs for a Parliament, at Chester; perhaps there never was a Convention, which consisted of Members more illegally assembled. For, First, Being not elected by their respective Counties and Boroughs, they could not possibly be qualified to represent them. And, Secondly, King Richard being manifestly under a Force, when he issued out his Writs, by which they were first Elected, their Proceedings could never have a just and legal Title to the Name of Laws, unless confirm'd by that Prince, when restored



stored to his full and entire Liberty. What shall we say then to the Laws enacted by that *Convention*, by which the Eleventh of *Richard II.* was confirmed, and that of the Twenty first of his Reign repeal'd, and many other *Acts* passed, which have hitherto been put in Execution, and are held of Force at this Day? Had they ever been declared good by a subsequent Parliament regularly assembled, this would be a sufficient Vindication of their Authority; but where is the *Act* to be found? It is true, in the next Parliament, (f) *Henry IV.* confirms all the good Laws made by himself and his Progenitors; but this Confirmation could not be of Force enough, to authorize any *Acts*, which were not good Laws before their Confirmation; for by the Rules of *Common Law*, the Confirmation of a void thing is also void: Upon which account (g) *Sydesfin* tells us; That it was made a Question among the Learned, whether the *Acts* of the Convention (*A. D.* 1660.) were good; notwithstanding the Confirmation in the 14 *Car. II.* I confess indeed, I see no Ground for any Doubt in this last Case; for the *Act* of Confirmation duly consider'd, clearly obviates all possible Questions, and particularly that which he states, of which it is plain the Parliament was aware. For it is observable; First, They are careful not to call it a Parliament, but only the Lords and Commons assembled; and the *Acts*, only *Acts* of the Lords and Commons, consented to by the King. Secondly, They declare, the Assembling and Acting in that Manner, is not to be drawn into Example. Thirdly, They not only ratify and confirm, but enact and declare the *Acts* there mention'd to have the Force of Laws, as if made in that Parliament; whereby all imaginable Doubts and Questions were effectually prevented, and the Authority of those *Acts* of the Convention beyond Contradiction establish'd and secur'd. But nothing of this Nature was done by *Henry IV.* in his subsequent Parliaments; neither does any thing appear upon Record sufficient to determine any Controversy, that should arise concerning the Validity of the *Acts* of (what is call'd) his First Parliament. From all which Instances it is abundantly manifest, that the *Acts* and Orders of Princes and Assemblies, which had no Legislative Capacity, may be observed as Laws, though they never had any due Confirmation; and then it is also evident, that

(f) Rot. Parl.  
 2 Hen. 4: 3:

(g) Sydesfin's Reports,  
 Part 1. Rep: 1:



that the Doctor has not proved his Point; supposing it to be true, *that the Acts of the Three Henrys were always executed as good Laws, tho' never confirm'd*; for it will not from thence follow, that their Authority was good and unquestionable.

(b) Calvin's  
Case.

THUS I have at large laid down the Reasons, why I cannot admit of the *Legislative Authority* of the Three Henrys; and particularly suggested some Difficulties, which will not suffer me to allow the Execution of their Acts of Parliament to be a good Argument for their original Validity. In a word, I have offer'd some Proofs, in my Opinion, of Weight enough, to satisfy an unprejudiced Reader, that the Acts of Parliament made by the House of Lancaster, were not in themselves of sufficient Force and Authority to oblige King *Edw. IV*; and this I imagine is all, that is needful for my Purpose. For it is a Doctrine laid down by my Lord Chief Justice Coke, (b) that *Kings that succeed by Hereditary Descent, are bound by the Acts of their Predecessors*; but then they must be supposed to be *Lawful Predecessors*; because no other Reason can possibly be assign'd, why this Rule did not take place in the Case of *Edward IV*, but only the Defect of Title in the Princes of the House of Lancaster. From whence we may observe this remarkable Distinction between a King *de Facto*, and a King *de Jure*; viz. That the Acts of Kings *de Jure* do bind their Successors, but those of Kings *de Facto* do not bind Kings *de Jure*; which overthrows effectually (if I may have Leave to speak with Assurance) all the Doctor's Reasonings from the *Acts of Parliament* of the Three Henrys. When I say, that *Edward IV.* was not bound by the Laws of the Kings *de Facto* his Predecessors, I would not be supposed to mean, that they were all absolutely *void* at his Acquisition of the Crown: For then it would be hard to conceive, how any of them could be capable of a *Confirmation*, according to the Maxim above-mention'd, *That the Confirmation of a void thing is itself void*: And the Truth is, to be *void*, being the same Thing as to have no Existence; it cannot be pretended, that a *Confirmation* gives a Being to that, which had none before; but only supplies those Defects of Strength and Authority, which it wanted. If I may therefore presume to speak freely on a Subject, which I am by no means qualified to be confident



dent in, I would distinguish between the *Acts of Parliament* of these Three Kings of the House of Lancaster; some whereof I would venture to say, were only voidable by King Edward IV, and the rest actually void upon his *Accession to the Crown*. First, I am of Opinion, that some (and those the much greater Part) of the Acts of the Three *Henrys*, were only voidable by King Edward IV, and not actually void at his *Entrance upon the Throne*; such I conceive were all those *Acts of Parliament*, which did not in the least prejudice the Right and Interest of the King *de Jure*; and were also conducive to the general Good of the Subject, and the Peace and Happiness of the Government: That these were not actually void in the Beginning of King Edward's Reign, I am very willing to allow; but then they depended entirely upon the Good-Will and Pleasure of Edward IV, whether their Authority should be fully establish'd, or utterly rejected: In order to which a (i) *Declaratory Act* was manifestly requisite, for the Quiet of the Subject, and the more orderly Proceedings in the Courts of Justice; without which they must have remain'd in the same precarious Condition, during his whole Reign. This I am persuaded is a rational Account of King Edward's Conduct, with respect to the Laws of his Three Predecessors; for though they were good against the Subject, who had already given his Consent to them; yet they could not bind the King against his Will and Approbation, which he might give, or refuse at his own proper Time; and therefore, as I have before observed, though he confirm'd some, and rejected others, yet we meet with an Instance of one, which seem'd to retain some Authority, till the Fourteenth Year of his Reign; which clearly proves, that all that while their Obligation was not fix'd and determin'd; as not being completely valid without a *Confirmation*, nor void without a *Declaratory Act*. So that these Acts of Parliament of the Three *Henrys*, remaining still upon Record, were executed by the Courts of Justice, and Officers of the Kingdom, without any Opposition or Interruption from the King;

(i) It was agreed (in Calvin's Case) that though Conquerors are not bound by the Laws of the Country, which they conquer; yet in all Conquests of Christians against

Christians, the Laws of those Countrys will remain in Force, without a Declaration to the contrary.



and therefore were of Force only by his *Permission*, not by the Authority of the Kings of the House of Lancaster. In a word, as it is (k) declared by Act of Parliament, that though the Pope had no Authority of impose his Decrees upon this Kingdom, yet many of them, for a long while, obtained the Force of Laws by *Royal Sufferance*, and *the free Consent of the Subjects*; the same thing may be said of the Laws of the Three *Henrys*: They were of no Authority by Virtue of any *Legislative Capacity* in the Makers of them; but being of Publick Use and Service, by the *Sufferance* of *Edward IV.* and his Successors, and the Approbation of the People, they have been constantly received and executed, as if they were made by Princes of an undoubted Title. And for a farther Proof, that this is no singular and unwarrantable Opinion, which I have here advanced, the following Instance will deserve the Reader's Perusal. King *Henry VIII.* having great Occasion for Money, which he was ashamed to ask for in Parliament, (their late Bounty to him having more than answered all his just Expectations) appoints Commissioners to collect a (l) *Benevolence* throughout his Kingdom: Now this being directly contrary to an Act of Parliament, made by (m) *Richard III.* that Statute was objected by one of the City Lawyers, against any farther Proceedings in that Collection; but it was answer'd immediately by the King's Counsel, (n) *That Laws made by Usurpers oblige not Legitimate Princes. That Richard III. was not only a Tyrant, but a Murderer of his own Nephews, &c. That Henry VIII. being the True and Undoubted Heir of the Crown, could be tied thereby no farther, than it pleased himself; it being absurd to think, that a Statute invented by a factious Assembly, and approved no otherwise, than by a Criminal in the highest Degree, should bind an Absolute and Lawful Monarch; wherefore if they had no better Evasion, it was not fit to maintain this.* Such was the Opinion in that Reign of the Laws of Kings de

(k) 25 Hen. 8. 21.

(l) Lord Herbert's *Life* of Hen. 8. Anno 1525. See also Sir Robert Cotton's *Posthuma*. Of the manner how Kings have supported themselves, pag. 177. where we meet with the following Passage: In the Time of Hen. 8. Anno 14. of his Reign, he exacteth by way of Loan, Ten Pound in the Hundred of all Goods,

Jewels, Utensils, and Land, and according to the extremest Rate revealed by Oath of the Possessors. Notwithstanding there is a Law, 1 *Richard 3.* that none shall be denied, in Demand of any Loan, his reasonable Excuse.

(m) 1 Rich. 3. 2.

(n) Lord Herbert, *ibid.*



*Facto* ; and the Consequence of it was, that the King proceeded in collecting the *Benevolence*, without any Regard to *Richard III.*'s Statute. This Piece of History I am persuaded is very pertinent to my Purpose, and a clear Proof, that I have very good Authority for my Opinion, that the Laws of Kings *de Facto* do not bind Kings *de Jure*, and are only of Force by their *Permission and Sufferance* ; and thus I leave it to the Doctor's Consideration. To conclude therefore, the Distinction between a King *de Facto*, and a King *de Jure*, is hereby sufficiently evident; that the latter can declare the other's Acts null and void, at his Pleasure ; but the former has no manner of Authority over the Acts of a King *de Jure*. And this is agreeable to the unanimous Opinion of all the Judges, which they deliver'd in a Question about the Grants of King *Edward IV.*, (o) in which they affirm, *that they are all good without any Confirmation*, which cannot be said reciprocally of the Acts of Kings *de Facto*.

BUT, Secondly, Though many of the Acts of Parliament of the Three *Henrys*, may very reasonably be allow'd to be only *voidable* by the King *de Jure* ; yet there were some of a different Nature, which were undoubtedly *void* upon King *Edward's* Accession to the Crown ; and such were all those, which were made against the *Title, Person, and Interest of that King, and his Family*. The Doctor allows it to be true, that the bare *Possession* of the Crown *voids* all *Attainders* ; and certainly the Reason is the same for the Nullity of all other *Acts* against the Right and Dignity of the True Heir, when he has gain'd his Inheritance ; and therefore I shall presume to say, that those *Acts* of the House of *Lancaster*, which limited the Succession of the Crown to their own Family, would have been of no Validity, though *Edward IV.* had never annulled them by the Authority of Parliament. If it should be asked, why then they were declared *void*, if they were *void* without such a Declaration ; I answer, That Princes have always thought this necessary, for the greater Security of themselves and Adherents, lest ano-

(o) *Year-Books*, 1 Rich. 3. 3. Term. Mich. Nota. Tenuz per tous les Justices, que tous les Grants fait per Edward le 4. à aucun homme d'aucun Office, nient Judic<sup>e</sup>, comme Parkership & hu-

jusmodi, ou Annuité grant à terme de vie, le grant est bon sans aucun confirmation ; autre est des Offices Judic<sup>e</sup>, car ceux sont voydes, &c.



ther Revolution should put their Enemies again in Possession of the Throne ; and then all the *Acts* made by them, which had not been vacated, would appear in Judgment against them, to their utter Ruin and Destruction.

(p) *Lord Bacon's Life of Hen. 7. Engl. Edit. Fol. P. 13.*

Thus, in the Case of *Henry VII.* though the Judges had given their Opinion, *that the Crown took away all Stops and Defects of Blood, yet that (p) Prince took Care to have it ordain'd in Parliament, that all Records, wherein there was any Memory or Mention of his Attainder, should be defaced, cancelled, and taken off the File.* Thus *Edward IV.* voided all those Laws, that had been made to the Disherison of the House of York ; and *Henry VI.* upon his Recovery of the Crown, annull'd those of *Edward IV.* against his Title. And lastly, in the like manner did *Edward IV.* some Time after his Restauration, treat the whole Parliament of *Henry VI.* But from these Instances it cannot fairly be inferred, that those Princes thought these *Acts* had Authority, without such an Annulment ; for we find, that sometimes the *Acts* of the most impudent Rebels, and vilest Usurpers, have had the Honour of being declared void in Parliament, though no body doubted of their being so without such a Declaration. Thus the *Acts* of John Cade, a most abominable Tyrant, horrible, odious, and errant false Traytor, and all Enditement, and all things depending thereof, had and made under the Power of his Tyranny and Rebellion, are (q) declared of no Record, nor Effect, but void in Law. And all (r) Attainders by Oliver and the succeeding usurped Powers, and (s) all Orders, Ordinances of both Houses, or either House of Parliament, for imposing Oaths, Covenants, or Engagements, levying of Taxes, &c. are declared void ; though in the same Act it is said, They were all null and void in their first Creation, and Making.

(q) 31 H. 6.  
c. 1.  
(r) 12 Car. 2.  
12.  
(s) 13 Car. 2.  
1.

I HAVE now examined every thing, which appear'd to me considerable in the Doctor's Plea for the Legislative Power of the Three *Henrys* ; and if I do not judge too indulgently of my Performance, have shew'd it to be defective in the several Points, which were most insisted on. At the same Time I imagine, I have made it evident, that the Example of *Edward IV.* is a clear Proof of the true Authority of Kings *de Jure*, in Opposition to the pretended Authority of Kings *de Facto*.



IN the next place the Doctor urges the Laws of Richard III. as a good Argument for his Legislative Capacity; and several Pages are spent, to convince us, that all his Acts of Parliament have been constantly executed, as equal to those of the most undoubted Authority; excepting only such, as were repealed by Henry VII; for that King (*says (t) he*) did not pretend to declare any of them *(t) View,* void; which he certainly would have done, if the Constitution *P. 44.* would have borne it, since some of the Acts of Richard III. were of that odious and detestable Nature, and his Person so justly abhorred, that it was doing him too much Honour to repeal those Acts, if they could have been set aside for Want of Authority in the Maker of them. To this purpose does the Doctor argue: And I very readily agree with him; I allow it to be true in Fact, that Henry VII. did not declare any Law of Richard III. void; and I am entirely of his Opinion, that the Constitution would not bear it; nay I am willing to grant, that this was a good Proof of the Legislative Authority of Richard III, with respect to Henry VII; and fully demonstrated, that the Laws of the former did bind the latter. But then I must beg Leave to dissent from the Doctor, when he infers from it in general, that the Laws of Kings *de Facto* are, in their own Nature, and without any Exception, good and valid. For, had Henry VII. as true an *Hereditary Right*, as he pretended, we should have met with a much different Account of his Proceedings on Record, from what we now find; but being himself in Reality no other than a King *de Facto*, it was impossible for him to act otherwise, than he did. How could he declare the Acts of his Predecessor void, upon the Account of his being an *Usurper*, when he knew, he was no better himself? Could his Laws be esteemed of greater Authority than Richard III.'s? And what a happy Discovery would it have been to his Subjects, to acquaint them, that whatever Laws he imposed upon them, they could not oblige his Successor; and consequently would have but a precarious Existence after his Demise? So that Richard III, considered with regard to Henry VII, was a King *de Jure*; as every King *de Facto* is to his Successor, who has no better Title; for whatever Laws are made by the one, will bind the other: And this undoubtedly is the true Reason, why Henry VII. repealed those Laws of Ri-



*chard* III. which he had a mind to get rid of; it being otherwise impossible to destroy their Authority. And nothing can be a more remarkable Proof for this Purpose, than an Instance, which, the Doctor fancied, did very much favour his *Hypothesis*; and that is in the Case of those, who had been attainted by *Richard* III; who were not permitted to sit in Parliament, till their *Attainders* were reversed by a particular *Act* for that purpose; but had *Henry* VII. been King *de Jure*, he would not have been obliged to those Formalities; for it may be remembred, what I before observed; that *Edward* IV. did not reverse those *Acts* of *Attainder* made by *Henry* VI. against his Adherents, till above seven (u) Years after his Restauration; in which Space of Time he had held several Parliaments, wherein those Lords and Gentlemen must have sat, before the Reversal of their *Attainders*; unless the Doctor can imagine, so great a Number of Persons, remarkable as well for their Quality and Fortunes, as for their Fidelity to their Prince, were all that while incapacitated to sit in Parliament. Thus it is evident, that the *Acts* of *Richard* III. were only valid against *Henry* VII, who having no better Title than *Richard*, could not pretend to declare them *void*, without bringing all his own *Acts* into question. If it should be now asked, how those of *Henry* VII. continued in Force, considering that he was succeeded by a Prince, that had an undoubted Right, not a bare King *de Facto*; the Answer is obvious; for this King of an undoubted Right was *Henry* VIII. his Son, who had too much Respect and Honour for his Father, to set a publick Mark on him as an Usurper, by annulling his *Acts*; and for this Reason it is; that the *Acts* of *Richard* III, as well as those of *Henry* VII, have always continued in Force; because *Henry* VIII, who had Authority enough to vacate them, and did vacate the *Act* against *Loans*, yet thought fit to permit them to be executed during his Reign; especially considering, there was nothing in them to the real Prejudice of the Crown; but on the contrary, they were generally of great Use and Service in promoting the Interest of his Government; and having been thus put in Execution through *Henry* VIII.'s Reign, none of his Successors would afterwards give themselves the Trouble of calling their Authority in question. This I take to be a reasonable and true Account

(u) Edward IV. recover'd Possession again in the 9th Year of his Reign, and the *Act* for Reversing the *Attainders* did not pass till the 17th.



count of the present Validity of those *Acts*; and no other, I believe, can possibly be given, which is consistent with the Power exercised by *Edward IV*, and *Henry VIII*, which belongs as well to every King *de Jure*, as it did to them.

WHEN I call *Henry VII.* King *de Facto*, I therein rather comply with the Humour and Inclinations of that Prince, than my own real Sentiments: For (x) from the Time of his Marriage with the Heiress of the House of *York*, he undoubtedly became King *de Jure*; and even before that Time, from the very Entrance of his Reign, he may be look'd upon as having a *Presumptive Right* to the Allegiance of the People of *England*, as he had obliged himself by an early Promise to marry that Princess, and the whole Nation was persuaded he would not fail to perform it. For (y) before he invaded King *Richard*, he had passed his Word, that he would make that Princess his Wife; which gave the greatest Encouragement to the Nobility, who considered the true Interest of their Country, when they assisted him in that great Enterprize: And in his first Parliament, the Commons did not forget to Address him to the same Purpose; and (z) the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, rising from their Seats, and standing before the King, as he sat upon his Royal Throne, with their Heads bowed, in a low Voice humbly Requested him, to make the Lady *Elizabeth* his Queen. To whom he (a) answer'd, with his own Mouth, That he was content to proceed according to their Desires and Requests. So that the People of *England*, from the first Commencement of his Reign, had reason to consider him as the *Husband* of the *Right Heir* to the Crown; and upon that Account their Obedience and Fidelity to him will admit of a fair Excuse and Justification. But *Henry VII.* esteem'd it a Diminution to him, to owe his Title to his Lady; and therefore, as if he was afraid of nothing so much, as being thought a *Lawful Prince*, he chose to found his Claim on his own *Hereditary Right*, his Victory, and the *Pope's* Confirmation; which were utterly incapable of affording him any real Support and Defence. His *Hereditary*

(x) *Archbishop Parker speaking of the Pope's Bull, in which several Titles are bestowed on Henry VII. adds, Solum Jus Divinum omisit, cujus etsi Ipse expers fuit, tamen illæ cœlitis datæ nuptiæ carere non potuerunt. Antiq. Britan. in*

*vitâ J. Morton. p. 297. Edit. Harleian.*

(y) *Lord Bacon's Life of Hen. VII. p. 2.*

(z) *Rot. Parl. 1 Hen. 7.*

(a) *Rot. Parl. ibid.*



*Title* has indeed been much talked of, and often taken for granted even by (b) Persons of Note and Eminency; and therefore it may be worth while, to give that Matter a thorough Examination.

It has been surmised, that *Henry VII.* had a Title to the Crown, as being descended from *John of Gaunt*, Duke of *Lancaster*; and tho' it be true, that the Pretensions of the House of *Lancaster* were condemned as *false and groundless* in the first Parliament of *Edward IV*; yet it is urged, that (c) *Henry VII.* having repealed that Act of *Edward IV*, by which *Henry VI.* his Queen and Son were attainted and disabled; all the Judgments made against that Family were consequently annulled, and their Right revived. But these Assertions will soon appear to be Mistakes.

First, It is pretended, that *Henry VII.* had an Hereditary Title, as being descended from *John of Gaunt*; and the Truth is, we find it in the (d) Record of Parliament, that the King [viz. *Henry VII.*] told the Commons with his own Mouth, that his Coming to the Crown was as well by a Just Title of Inheritance, as by the True Judgment of God, &c. and in one of the (e) printed Statutes it is said, his Coming into *England* was for the recovering and obtaining his Just Title and Right to this his Realm of *England*. So that it seems his Right and Title commenced antecedently to his Possession of the Crown, and before any of the Laws of *Edward IV.* which had set aside the Title of the House of *Lancaster*, were repealed. But surely the *Beaufort* Family, from whence only he derived his Descent by his Mother, were the *Illegitimate Issue* of *John of Gaunt*, and *Katharine Swinford*, being born before Marriage, and consequently, by the Laws of *England*, incapable of claiming any Rights by Inheritance. They were indeed afterwards legitimated by (f) Act of Parliament; and rendred capable of every thing, but the *Succession to the Crown*; from which they were excluded

(b) *My Lord Bacon himself has countenanced this Opinion in his History; and the Bishop of Sarum (Hist. Ref. Part 1. B.) thinks, the only Objection against Henry VII.'s Title was his Mother's being alive, from whom he derived it. And Dr. Higden has declared himself of the same Sentiments. View, p. 66. And Defence, p. 165.*

(c) Rot. Parl. 1 Hen. 7.

(d) Rot. Parl. 1 Hen. 7. D. Rex præfatis Communibus ore suo proprio eloquens, ostendit suum Adventum ad Jus & Coronam Angliæ fore tam per justum Titulum Hereduarium, quam per verum Dei judicium; &c.

(e) 1 Hen. 7. 6.

(f) Rot. Parl. 20 Ric. 2.



by exprefs Words in that Statute, as my Lord Chief Justice (g) *Coke* observes; and therefore it is impossible to conceive, how *Henry VII.* could, with any Colour of Justice, lay Claim to the Crown of *England* by Descent.

BUT, Secondly, It is pretended, that all those Acts of *Edward IV.* which destroyed the Title of the House of *Lancaster*, were repealed in the first Year of *Henry VII.* Thus Sir *George Treby* (h) says, That in the First of *Henry VII.* there is an Act made, that sets aside all the Acts and Attainders made against his Line, and consequently repealed 1 *Edward IV.* which repealed 1 *Henry IV.* And so far (i) Dr. *Higden* agrees with him, as to affirm, That *Edward IV.*'s Attainders of *Henry VI.* were revers'd and annull'd, and *Henry VI.*'s Title restored by Act of Parliament, in the first Parliament of *Henry VII.*: And again, (k) *Henry VII.* in the first Year of his Reign, pass'd an Act of Parliament, wherein it is enacted, That all Acts of Attainder or Disablements against the late King *Henry VI.* be void, annull'd, and repealed, &c. So that the Force of all the former Declarations and Acts of Parliament against *Henry VI.* is taken off by this last Act of Parliament, which restores his Title. Now the Truth of this Matter will best appear by a Sight of the Act itself, which I shall here set down out of the Record. 1 *Hen. 7.* The King our Sovereign Lord remembring, how against Righteousness, Honour, Nature, and Duty, an inordinate, seditious, and slanderous Act was made against the most famous Prince of Blessed Memory, King *Henry VI.* his Uncle, in Parliament, in the first Year of *Edward IV.* late King of England; Whereby his said Uncle, contrary to due Allegiance, and all due Order, was attainted of High Treason. Wherefore our Sovereign Lord, &c. ordained, that the said Act, and all Acts of Attainder, Forfeiture, and Disablement, made or had in the same Parliament, be Void, Annull'd, and Repealed, and of no Force, or Effect. From whence it is evident, that by this Repeal only those particular Acts, or rather Clauses of Acts, were abrogated, whereby the Heirs of (l) *Henry Earl of Derby* were declared evermore unabled, and unworthy to have, joy, occupy, hold, or inherit any Estate, Dignity, Pre-eminence, Enheritements, or Possessions within the Realm of *England*, &c. All the other Judgments of Parliament, for the Title of *Edward IV.*

(g) See Lord Chief Justice Coke's 4th Institut. c. 1. of the Parliament; and the whole Act in the Appendix, N. 4.

(h) Debate at the Conference concerning the Abdication, p. 50.

(i) View, p. 36.

(k) View, p. 58.

(l) Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4.



and against that of the House of Lancaster, still remaining unrepealed, and in full Force. The utmost therefore, that can be collected from this Statute of Henry VII. is no more than this; That those Incapacities, which arose from Corruption of Blood, and Forfeiture, were now removed from Henry VI. and his Heirs: But that was not sufficient to restore his Title to the Crown; the (m) *Act of Parliament*, on which it depended, having been annull'd by Edward IV, and never again revived. And indeed there was no imaginable Reason, why Henry VII. should attempt to restore the Title of the House of Lancaster; since it could not possibly help him to any Pretence of Right, as I have already proved; and would be prejudicial to the Claim of the House of York, the firmest Support of his Throne, upon which only he could rely.

But though Henry VII. were no more than a King *de Facto* before his Marriage, I am willing to consider him under a much different Character afterwards, when he became the Husband of the undoubted Heir to the Crown. In which Case, though the Queen alone was Legally entitled to the Executive Power; yet the most scrupulous Subject had no Reason to think her injur'd, when it was exercised by her Husband; on whom, it might very justly be presumed, she had freely devolv'd all her Right, and Authority. In this respect therefore the Title of Henry VII. could not well be disputed; since in Judging of the Rights of Princes, nothing more is necessary, than to be assur'd, that Allegiance may be paid to them, without doing any Wrong to a third Person; by which Rule the Authority of Henry VII. became unquestionable; and without the least Doubt or Scruple, he might very honestly be acknowledged as King *de Jure*. So that from the Time of his Marriage, we are to look

(m) *The Entail of the Crown made by Henry 4, (7 Hen. 4. 2.) on his Issue, was declared null and void by Edward 4. (Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4.) in the following Words: Be it ordained, declared, and establish'd, that all Statutes, Acts, and Ordinances heretofore made, in and for the Hurt, Destruction, and Avoiding of the Right and Title of King Richard, or of his Heirs, to ask, claim, or have the Crown*

Royal, Power, Estate, Dignity, Pre-eminence, Governance, Exercise, Possessions, and Lordships aforesaid, be void, and be taken, holden, and reputed void, and for nought, annulled, repealed, revoked, and of no Force, Value, or Effect. Which Act of Annulment made by Edward 4, was never repealed by Henry 7.



upon him as perfectly endued with a Legislative Capacity, which secures all his subsequent Laws from the Objection, to which those made in the Beginning of his Reign were liable.

FROM these Observations and Remarks on the Title of *Henry VII.* I proceed to the Consideration of that (n) Statute of his, which has been often cited, as the surest Support of the Authority of Kings *de Facto*; and is still relied upon, as the safest Retreat, when all other Arguments fail: But if the (o) Authority of Kings *de Facto* had been always acknowledged; and the Allegiance, which this Statute declares to be due to them, was ever paid in this Realm; and both the one and the other justified by the Common and Statute Law of the Kingdom, in the Reigns of Hereditary Kings; why could not *Henry VII.* be contented with the Provision already made for the Protection of his Adherents? What Occasion was there for a new Law to establish a Privilege, which had been long a known Part of the Constitution, and the Birth-right of every *English* Subject? And it is apt to increase one's Wonder, to see my Lord *Bacon's* Authority (p) alledged, to shew the *Wisdom, Justice, and Magnanimity* of this Statute; for where was the *Wisdom*, to do a Thing that was unnecessary? The *Justice*, to give what no-body had Reason to demand? Or the *Magnanimity*, to defend those, who were in no manner of Danger? But it may be, these are nice and frivolous Questions; and therefore I hasten to a strict Enquiry into the true Meaning of this Statute; and that certainly may be best collected from the (q) Condition and Circumstances of the Law-giver, and the End for which this Statute was intended. If we consider the Condition and Circumstances of *Henry VII.* at the Making of this Statute, it is plain, as I have already shewed, he was a King *de Jure*, as well as *de Facto*; and the (r) Doctor, to do him Justice, is very willing, it should

(n) 11 Hen. 7. 1.

(o) Dr. *Higden's View*, p. 64. He says, This Act has lain under a great Prejudice, as if it introduced a new Authority, and a new Allegiance, not known before in our Constitution, &c. p. 64.

(p) *Defence*, p. 125.

(q) It is a good Rule for the Understanding of Statutes, to know what were the Mischiefs and Grievances in the Kingdom,

which the Parliament meant to remedy: For, as it is observed in the Institutes, many Records of Parliament can hardly be understood, unless you join thereunto the History of the Times. See the Jurisdiction of Chancery vindicated, at the End of the Reports of Cases in Chancery, p. 70.

(r) *View*, p. 65, 66. *Defence*, p. 123.



be admitted, that he was so. And indeed, whoever impartially examines the Circumstances of those Times, will easily be satisfied, that it was impossible for Henry VII. to be invaded, or dispossessed of the Throne by any Person, that had so good a Right as himself; so that he had no body to fear, but an unjust Pretender; and was only in Danger from those, that had no Legal Claim to the Crown: He had no Reason therefore to be particularly concern'd for the Safety of his Friends, as a King *de Facto*; for he knew, he was *de Jure* too, with respect to any one, that should oppose him; and surely (how equitable soever such an Act might be in some respects) he could never be moved to it from a just, and wise Calculation of any real Advantage, that would accrue to him from it; but had Reason rather to apprehend the contrary: For, considering the Posture of Affairs at that Time, that he was daily threatned with a powerful Invasion, which for ought he knew might succeed; he might easily foresee, that his Enemies then would reap the greatest Benefit from this Act: For had Henry VII. lost a Battle, and been driven from his Throne, the People would have been bound, by Virtue of this Act, in the Sense now put upon it, to have defended the Usurper against him; and could never have been punished for so doing. Whatever therefore might have been the real Design of this Law, it could not certainly be the primary and chief Intention of it, to support the Thrones of ambitious Intruders, by what Means soever they succeeded in their bold and daring Enterprizes: Such a Law as this, was so apparently dangerous to Henry VII, that it cannot well be imagined to have been ever in his Thoughts. And there is this farther Prejudice against the Doctor's Opinion, that this Statute (if intended wholly for the Advantage of Kings *de Facto*) would have occasion'd the severest Censure imaginable upon Henry VII.'s Reign; for if (s) it was against all Law, Reason, and good Conscience, that Subjects going into Wars with Kings *de Facto*, should lose or forfeit for doing this their Duty of Allegiance; the Doctor will find it a very difficult Matter to discover, upon what Principles of Justice so many Persons were attainted, for no other Reason, but for being in the Service of Richard III. The Doctor may easily satisfy

(s) *The Words*  
of the Act,  
11 Hen. 7. 1.



tisfy himself in this Matter from the (t) Rolls of Parliament, where he will find (u) many Persons of Note attainted, purely for following the Fortune of that King, and assisting him in the Battle of *Bosworth-Field*; and it deserves the Doctor's particular Reflexion, that at the very Time, when this *Just and Merciful Act* (for so I find it is esteem'd) was passed, several of those Gentlemen continued still under *Attainder*, as appears from the Records of the 11th and 12th Years of *Henry VII.* It must be confessed, the Doctor has been pleas'd to take Notice of this Objection; but then he has given it such an Answer, as I have too much Respect for him, to call by its proper Name. *It is objected* (says he) *that these Princes sometimes attainted some of the Leaders of the Opposite Party for adhering to their Rivals. But when they did this, their constant Way of Proceeding against such Persons, was by Attainders in Parliament ex post Facto, and not by Indictments in the ordinary Course of Proceedings; which shews, I think, at the same time, that to serve the King in Possession was not a Fault, nor could be punished as such by the Laws that were then in Force.* Now, if I might do it without Imper- tinence, I would ask the Doctor the Meaning of *Attainders* in Parliament *ex post Facto*; for surely none were heard of *ante Factum*. Laws indeed have been some- times made *ex post Facto*, whereby Actions have been sub- jected to Punishment, which were not Criminal when they were committed: But the Doctor knows very well, this is not the present Case; for it cannot be affirmed, that any new Laws were made in *Edward IV.*'s and *Henry VII.*'s Reigns, which made People *Traytors*, who might not have been condemn'd as such, by Laws before in Being. That many were judg'd guilty of *Treason*, and attainted upon that Account in their Parliaments, is very certain; but we are to presume, those Proceedings were founded upon a Law already made: For my Lord Chief Justice (x) *Coke* tells us, *That by Order of Law*

(t) *The Names of those attainted at that Time were these that follow: John Duke of Norfolk, Thomas Earl of Surrey, Francis Lovell, Walter Devereux, Lord Ferrers, John Lord Zouche, Robert Harrington, Richard Charleton, Richard Radcliffe, William Berkly of We- ly, Robert Brackenbury, Thomas Pil-*

*kington, Robert Middleton, James Har- rington Knt. Walter Hopton, William Catesby, Roger Wake, William Sap- cott, Humphrey Stafford, William Clerk of Wenlock, Jeffrey St. Germain, Ri- chard Watkins, with several others.*

(u) *View*, p. 47.

(x) *Inst.* 4. ch. 1. p. 39.



*The Hereditary Right of the*

a Man cannot be attainted of High-Treason, unless the Offence be in Law High-Treason; and therefore he ought not to be attainted by general Words of High-Treason, by Authority of Parliament. He owns indeed, that this had sometimes been done; but then he does not pretend to give any other Instances of it, besides the Case of *Elizabeth Barton*, and Lord *Cromwell*, in *Henry VIII.*'s Time. So that it were to be wish'd, the Doctor had been less forward in affirming, that the *Attainders* in Parliament were occasion'd, for Want of Law to punish Persons out of Parliament; for their *Attainders* suppos'd them to be *Criminal*, but did not make them so; and therefore they might have been tryed, and condemn'd in the *Ordinary Courts of Justice*, had it been thought necessary. The Truth is, it is a vain Imagination of the Doctor's, that the Reason of *Attainders* in Parliament was, because such Persons could not be proceeded against by Indictments; the contrary being easily demonstrated by Multitudes of Instances, which would abundantly shew, that the true Cause of giving Judgment in these Cases in Parliament, was rather for the sake of Expedition, upon the Account of the Number of Criminals, and to prevent unnecessary Delays, especially when the Facts, which were the Reasons of those *Attainders*, were Notorious; and therefore there was no occasion for those tedious Methods of Proof, which are used in the inferior Courts of Justice.

BUT I return now to *Henry VII.*'s Statute, which could not be intended purely for the Benefit of Kings *de Facto*, for the Reasons I have now given; but that the Safety and Interest of that Prince's Friends and Adherents were consulted by it, can never be doubted; for by Virtue of it, they had been effectually protected, tho' *Henry VII.* had lost his Throne. And this I think will appear from the following Considerations, which will much contribute to the deciding our present Controversy. *First*, That all Laws made by Kings *de Jure* bind their Successors. *Secondly*, That *Henry VII.* was King *de Jure* at the Time of making this Law; and could not be dispossest'd of his Throne, but by a Person, who had less Right to it than himself: And *Thirdly*, That when this Act was passed, *Henry VII.* was daily threatned with an Invasion from *Perkin Warbeck*; the Issue of which, in regard to the Hatred, which was still borne him by the  
Friends



Friends to the House of York, could not but be doubtful and uncertain. These things consider'd, it will certainly be allowed, there was great occasion for such a Law, as would effectually secure his Adherents from the Danger of incurring a Forfeiture of their Lives, Estates, and Liberties, which, without such Provision, could not possibly be safe. For, as *Henry VII.* had attainted those that fought for *Richard III.*; so *Perkin*, if he had succeeded, might have used those, that were in Arms for *Henry VII.* in the same manner; unless disabled by some Legal Restraint, such as this Statute was; which provides amply for the Security of all those, that attended *Henry VII.* in his Wars. In a word, as without such a Law the Party of *Henry VII.* would have been in great Danger, had their Army been defeated; so by Virtue of it, they must have been entirely safe: Because as *Henry VII.* and his Parliament would not presume to slight the Authority of the Laws of *Richard III.*, but esteem'd them all good and obligatory; upon the same Principles, whoever had forced *Henry VII.* from his Throne, and taken Possession of it, must have been obliged by his Laws, and could have done nothing against them, without Violence and Injustice. So that whereas it had been usual in former Revolutions, to attaint in Parliament the *Defeated Party*; this Law of *Henry VII.* was an effectual Bar against such Proceedings; and would be able sufficiently to protect his Friends from all manner of Forfeitures and Attainders. This I take to be the genuine and true Meaning of this Law; and if I am not much mistaken, no other Exposition of it will be found so worthy of the Character of *Henry VII.*; so suitable to the Circumstances of those Times; and so intelligible and rational: For from hence it will presently appear, why Serving *Henry VII.* in his Wars, is styled in this Act, *doing their true Duty and Allegiance*; and why it is also said, *to be against all Laws, Reason, and good Conscience, that Subjects should suffer for so doing*; viz. because *Henry VII.* having a Right at that Time to be consider'd as King *de Jure*, he had a good Title to the Obedience of his Subjects; and consequently the Punishing them upon that Account, would have been an Action in itself highly unreasonable, and unjust. And this was so far the Case of *Richard III.*, that had he made such a Law



Law as this, for indemnifying those, that fought for him; they could not possibly have been attainted by *Henry VII*: So that the Wisdom of this Law, thus explained, is highly to be extolled, and is truly admirable; since now, whatever might be the Events of War, Subjects could never suffer for defending their Lawful (y) Prince; the Power of the prevailing Invader being now limited to that Degree, that he must first do Violence to the Laws, before he could hurt the Persons or Fortunes of those that opposed him. A Consideration undoubtedly of great Moment, for the encouraging of Subjects to persevere in their Fidelity to *Lawful* Princes; for though it ever was, and will be *against Reason, and good Conscience*, to punish Persons for doing this their Duty; yet it will always be found true, that the general Laws of Nature have never that Authority and Influence over Ambitious Princes, as those particular Laws of the Kingdom they are to Govern. And the Reason is plainly this; because they had much rather offend God, whom they do not fear, than their People, whom they do. And therefore, though it was an Action in itself just, and lawful, to defend *Richard III.* against *Henry VII.* who had no manner of Title to the Crown; yet since *Richard* was, in other respects, no better than a *King de Facto*; and no Act of Parliament had particularly provided for the Safety of those, that fought for him; we see *Henry VII.* was so little moved with any Considerations of *Reason, and good Conscience*, as to proceed with the utmost Severity against them in his Parliaments.

By what I have said upon this Occasion, it is evident, that *Henry VII.* could propose no Advantage to himself from this Statute, any otherwise, than as he

(y) 30th Sept. 1644. *King Charles I.* issued out a Proclamation, declaring his Resolutions for a Speedy Peace; in which are the following Words. We do desire all of them, as well in our own Quarters, as where the Rebels have usurped a Power, to take into serious Consideration the Duty and Loyalty, which by the Law of God, and their Oath of Allegiance, they owe to us; and more particularly that Part thereof, which concerns the Defence of our Person, and Assistance of us against Rebels, and such as rise in

Arms against us; which they may find plainly set down in the Statute of the 11th Year of *Henry VII.* cap. 1. The Perusal of this Statute he had earnestly recommended before, in his Answer to the Declaration of the Parliament, May 4. 1642. And afterwards, in his Answer to their Remonstrance, May 26. 1642. speaking of this Statute, he says, His Good Subjects will read it with Comfort. See *Rushworth's Collections*, Part 3. Vol. 1. p 598.



was King *de Jure*; that is, as he was in Danger from no Adversary, who had a better Title than himself. And from thence I shall presume to infer, that the Interest and Security of the Followers of Kings *de Facto*, was not the original Design or Intention of this Law. If it is objected, that whatever the Intention of the *Lawgivers* might have been, the Words of it are plainly applicable to Kings *de Facto*; and in this Sense have been often expounded by some of the most eminent Lawyers; I must deny, that the Words are thus fairly to be understood: And indeed if they were, the Act would be manifestly inconsistent with itself. *First*, I say, the Words are not properly and fairly applicable to a King *de Facto*; because, though a King *de Facto* is a King *for the Time being*, yet he is such a one, as could not possibly be thought of in this Statute; for Kings *de Jure* cannot well be supposed to intend the Good and Interest of *Usurpers*; nor could Henry VII, for the same Reason, mean any other by a King *for the Time being*, than such a one, as himself was: And whoever is of a contrary Opinion, may as well believe, that Henry VII, when he made this Statute, design'd it only for the Service of *Perkin Warbeck*, who was like to be King *for the Time being* in a few Months, for any thing that could be certainly foreseen to the contrary. *Secondly*, This Law would be inconsistent with itself, if applied to Kings *de Facto*; for the last Clause of it utterly excludes such an Interpretation. The Words are these; *Provided alwaie, that no Person or Persons shall take any Benefit or Advantage by this Act, which shall hereafter decline from his or their said Allegiance*: That is, whoever at this Time (when Henry VII. was threatened with an Invasion) should declare for *Perkin Warbeck*, and should endeavour to support his Interest, and maintain him in his unjust Acquisitions; they were not to have the Benefit of this Statute, if ever Henry VII. should again recover his Right; though they might plead they had been in the Service of a King *for the Time being*. From whence it is beyond Contradiction evident, even by the Authority of this Statute, that there may be some Kings *de Facto*, to whom it may be dangerous to do any Service; I mean such, as should depose a Rightful Prince, (which was the Design of *Perkin Warbeck*) and place themselves in his Throne; for it is expressly declared in



(z) *This is  
own'd by the  
Doctor him-  
self, View,  
p. 68.*

the Clause abovementioned, that this Statute should not be available to any Persons, who act in the Defence of such Usurpers against the (z) Prince, to whom their *Allegiance* was before due.

BUT if, notwithstanding all I have now urged to the contrary, it shall be still thought reasonable to believe, that this Statute was at first intended, and may, upon a proper Occasion, be made use of, for the Interest and Benefit of the Adherents to a King *de Facto*; I must however desire those, who are of this Opinion, to abate something of their Confidence, till those, who are the proper Judges of such Matters, have by their publick Resolutions determin'd the Sense of it. For though some great Lawyers have left certain Passages in their Writings, in Favour of this Opinion, (which I am hastning to examine) yet the Meaning of this Law was never yet ascertain'd by any Judicial Proceedings; nor was it ever yet put in Execution by the Courts of Justice. It was pleaded indeed by the *Regicides*, at their Tryal; and they were the only Persons, that ever claim'd any Benefit from it; but it is well known, the Court over-ruled their Plea, as not at all pertinent, or of any manner of Use upon that Occasion. It is true, Chief Baron *Bridgeman* did then give his Opinion concerning this Sta-

(a) *J. Cook's  
Tryal.*

tute, *viz.* (a) *That it was made for a King de Facto against a King de Jure*: But I shall presently shew, that his Lordship's usual Exactness herein fail'd him; which could not possibly have happen'd, had the Consideration of this Statute come properly before him, and any Strefs been really laid upon it; for then his Lordship would have had more Leisure to form his Judgment, before he had deliver'd it. So that if it should fall out (as who can tell, what Revolutions may happen in a Country given to Change?) that a King *de Jure*, some time or other, should by Force and Violence dispossess a King *de Facto* of his Throne; who can be sure, what the Opinion of Parliament, or the Judges may be, when those that shall have followed the Fortunes of the King in Possession, shall plead this Statute for Protection and Impunity? Surely it may be a Question, whether then such Persons will be allowed to have *done their true Duty of Allegiance*; and consequently, whether I am in the wrong or no, is at least a Point not yet decided; cannot safely be sub-

mitted



mitted to any private Judgment; and may possibly at last be determin'd agreeably with the Opinion I have now delivered.

I AM in the next place to take Notice of certain Passages, which the Doctor has cited, to prove, that some of the greatest Lawyers have been of his Mind in the Exposition of this Statute; but since my Lord *Bacon* and *Bridgeman* are the only two he has mention'd, who speak directly, and purposely concerning it, I need not trouble myself at present about any other. As for my Lord *Bacon*, I must confess, I am at a Loss, how to understand him; when he says, (b) *This was a Law of a strange Nature, rather Just than Legal, and more Magnanimous than Provident*; for it is not easy to conceive, how a Law can be *Just*, and not *Legal*; unless his Lordship meant, that it was not agreeable with the Laws then in Being, and the *Constitution* of the Government: Which Opinion would be directly contrary to what the Doctor has asserted throughout his Books; where we are often told, that the Indemnity of those, who serv'd a King *de Facto*, was sufficiently provided for before *Henry VII.*'s Reign. But I return to my Lord *Bacon*; He tells us, that this Law was more magnanimous than provident: And soon after he says, it had *Parts of prudent and deep Foresight*; because *People were thereby hindred from busying themselves in prying into the King's Title*; for that however it fell, their *Safety was now provided for*. And upon the same Account, he thinks it agreeable to Reason of State; because otherwise the *Subjects might trouble themselves with Enquiries into the Justness of the King's Title, or Quarrel*. But I think I have clearly proved, that *Henry VII.*, at the Time of Making this Law, had a good Title against every body; since his Queen's Consent was never doubted of, whose Claim and Opposition alone could render him an *Usurper*. So that he had no Cause to be disturbed about the *People's prying into his Title*, since they could not dispute his Queen's; upon which, at last, if he had found it necessary, he would have been sure to have plac'd his Confidence and Dependence. For, I beg Leave to add, had *Perkin Warbeck* been the Real, as it was well known, he was only the Fictitious Son of *Edward IV.*; and had his Enterprize succeeded; *Henry VII.* was too wise a Prince, to imagine, this Law of his would have

(b) Hist.  
Hen. 7. p.  
144.



have been able to secure those, that fought for him : He knew very well, by the then late Example of *Edward IV*, that the Laws of Kings *de Facto* could not bind Kings *de Jure*, especially when directly against their Interest and Advantage ; and therefore had he been in Danger from any *Rightful Pretender*, he would not have given himself the Trouble of making a Law, that could do his Party no Manner of Service. Let it not now be thought too great a Presumption in me, to say, my Lord *Bacon* was mistaken in this Point ; for as he could not be a Man, if he was not subject to Error ; so he may still be a great one, though his Judgment sometimes fails him.

(c) View;  
p. 82.  
(d) View,  
p. 65, 66.

MY Lord Keeper *Bridgeman's* Opinion is in the Tryal of *Cook* the *Regicide* ; where speaking of this Law of *Henry VII*, he has these Words ; King *Henry* took Care for him who was King *de Facto*, that his Subjects might be encouraged to follow him ; to preserve them, whatever the Event of the King was. And again, That that King *Henry VII*. did, was to take Care of the King *de Facto* against the King *de Jure*. This Passage the (c) Doctor fancies is fully to his Purpose ; though, in another Place, (d) he allows *Henry VII*. to be a King *de Jure* ; and the Truth is, who the King *de Jure* was, that *Henry VII*. took Care against in this Statute, will be past any one's Power to find out. I must take the Liberty therefore to say, with a just Deference to the Learning and Judgment of that worthy Person, that his Lordship suffer'd himself here to fall into this Error, through Inadvertency, and want of a due Regard to the Condition and Circumstances of *Henry VII*, who was so far from being barely a King *de Facto*, at the Time we are speaking of, that it will be very difficult to have a right Notion of a King *de Jure*, if he was not so.

THE Doctor will not give me Leave to finish my Discourse on this Argument ; and I must obey him. It had been objected, that when the Duke of *Northumberland* was tried for being in Arms for the Lady *Jane Grey*, it would have been proper for him to have pleaded this Statute, if it was really for the Benefit of those, that served a King *de Facto* ; and it had likewise been observed, that he did actually alledge in his Defence, that he acted by a Commission under the Great Seal, and by Order of a Privy Council ; to which the Reply made by the Court



Court was, *That the Great Seal, which he pretended for his Warrant, was not the Seal of the Lawful Queen of the Realm, but the Seal of an Usurper, who had no Authority.* ] (Stow's and Holinshead's Chronicles.) Now the Doctor has not thought fit to take Notice of this Declaration of the Duke of Northumberland's Judges; but contents himself with the following Answer: *First, (e) He says, it is to be observed, that Queen Mary, in a Letter she writ to the Lords of the Council, notified her Claim, and required them, upon their Allegiance, to proclaim her Title at London: That this Letter was deliver'd to the Lords, not only before they had proclaim'd the Lady Jane, but before they had published King Edward's Death, or so much as acquainted the Lady Jane with their Design to set her up to succeed him; as appears both from the Bishop of Sarum's History of the Reformation, and from Dr. Heylin's. The latter has printed this Letter at large; in which there is a Passage, that would induce one to believe, that she had been proclaim'd somewhere before she writ it.* (e) View, P. 67, &c.

BUT, *First*, Were the Doctor in the right in all these Points of History, they would not fully turn to his Account: For were it true, that the Lady Jane was never in Possession of the Crown; and consequently, that the Duke of Northumberland did not act under the Broad-Seal, and by Order of the Council of a Queen de Facto; yet it would be nevertheless true also, that the Judges were of Opinion, that the Broad-Seal of an Usurper was of no Authority; which is the main thing the Doctor's Adversaries insisted upon; and therefore chiefly deserved his Consideration.

*Secondly*, It is not so clear a Case, as he is pleas'd to believe, that the Lady Jane was not in Possession of the Crown; for not only her own Council was of that Opinion; but Queen Mary seems to confess it; and many Circumstances concur to shew, it was a Fact, which could not well be doubted of. *First*, I say, her own Privy Council made no question of her being Queen de Facto; for they expressly affirm it in their Letter to the Sheriff of Kent; which begins thus: (f) *After our hearty Commendations, &c. Whereas the Queen's Highness Queen Jane, being presently by Just Title in full Possession of the Imperial Crown of this Realm, and other Dominions, and Pre-eminences thereunto belonging, &c. which I should not* (f) This Letter was dated July 12. 1553. and a Copy of it will be found in the Appendix, N. 5.



inſiſt upon; if we were only diſputing the Point of Right; for therein we are ſure they err'd. But whether the Lady *Jane* was in *Poſſeſſion* or no, was a Matter of *Fact*, which they could not be miſtaken in; and I hope the Characters of Archbiſhop *Cranmer*, Sir *William Cecil*, and Sir *John Cheek*, (three of the Subſcribers to this Paper, not to mention the reſt) will protect them from the baſe Suſpicion of ſaying any thing, contrary to their Knowledge. Secondly, Queen *Mary* herſelf confeſſes as much; for ſhe openly declares, (g) That her own moſt Lawful Poſſeſſion was for a Time diſturb'd and diſquieted, by the Trayterous Rebellion and Uſurpation of the Lady *Jane Grey*; and we have obſerved, that the Judges gave their Opinion at the Tryal of the Duke of *Northumberland*, that the Broad-Seal of that Lady, being an Uſurper, was of no Authority: Now ſhe could no otherwiſe diſturb the Poſſeſſion of that Queen, than by being in the Throne herſelf; neither could ſhe deſerve the Name of an Uſurper, but by ſettling the Crown upon her own Head, which belonged to another Perſon. Thirdly, Several other Circumſtances concur to ſhew, it was a Matter of Fact, that cannot well be doubted of: Did not King *Edward's* Council openly and avowedly declare for Her? Did not all the Judges, and many of the firſt Quality in the Kingdom, ſubſcribe to King *Edward's* Device of the Succeſſion? And was not the (h) chief Body of the Nobility on her ſide? inſomuch that it may be queſtion'd, whether the Duke of *Northumberland* could have been tryed, if thoſe Lords had been excepted out of the Number of his Judges, who had been guilty of the ſame Crime with himſelf. Laſtly, Was not the City and Tower of *London*, and all the Forts of the Kingdom, in her Hands? And was there any viſible Power in the Realm for ſome time, that ſeem'd capable of oppoſing her Pretenſions? But after all, the (i) Doctor is poſitive, that ſhe was never ſettled in the Throne; but fell, whiſt the Duke of *Northumberland* and his Faction was ſtruggling to thruſt her into it. But ſhe might be Queen

(g) 1 Mar. 4.

(h) The Lady *Jane's* Council in their Letter to Queen *Mary* (June 9. in Fox and Holinſhead) tell her, That King *Edward* had appointed the Lady *Jane* his Succeſſor, by his Letters Patent, ſign'd

with his own Hand, and ſealed with the Great Seal of *England*, in Preſence of the moſt part of the Nobles, Counſellors, Judges, &c. ſubſcribing the ſame.

(i) View, p. 68.



*de Facto*, tho' she was not fully in Possession; for he allows the Title of King to Stephen, tho' for much the greater Part of his Reign, he was hardly Master of more than half the Kingdom; and Edward IV. is said in the (k) Records, to have been in Possession of the Crown from the 4th of March, tho' Henry VI. was then at the Head of a greater Army than his, and the fatal Battle of Towton-Field was not fought till some while after.

*Thirdly*, The Doctor's Observations from History, against the Possession of the Lady Jane, are not so incontestable, as he may imagine. Queen Mary's Letter to her Brother's Council, which he cites from Dr. Heylin, had been first printed by Mr. Fox and Holinshed: Now, though she lays Claim to the Crown in that Letter, yet she did not assume the Regal Title and Style; for it is not Dated in the First Year of her Reign: And Dr. Heylin will acquaint the Doctor, that she did not take upon her the Name of Queen, till she came to Framlingham Castle in Suffolk, which was eight or nine Days after King Edward's Death. From whence we may observe, that the Doctor is also mistaken in another Point of History, when he pretends, that Queen Mary had been proclaim'd Queen, before the Lady Jane: This could not certainly be done by her Order, before she took upon her the Title of Queen, which I have shewed was not till the fourteenth of June; but the Lady Jane was proclaim'd on the tenth. Queen Mary indeed sent to the Mayor of Norwich on the twelfth of July to proclaim her; but (l) my Author says, finding the Norfolk Men not so forward as she expected, she removes with her small Party to Framlingham. That the Lady Jane knew nothing of the Design of making her Queen, three or four Days after King Edward's Death, is hardly credible; surely she knew, that King Edward had appointed her his Successor, a Month before: And Doctor (m) Heylin (an Author whom the Doctor chooses to cite upon these Occasions) expressly affirms, That (on the tenth of June) the Lady Jane could not be ignorant of

(k) Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4. It is declared, That Edward IV. was in Right, from the Death of the Noble and Famous Prince his Father, very Just King of England, and in the 4th Day of March in Lawful Possession of the said Realm. --- And afterwards, he is said to have been lawfully seized and possessed, from the

4th of March, of all Castles, Lordships, Mannors, Lands, &c. as Richard II. was possessed of, in the Feast of St. Mauben, in the 23d Year of his Reign.

(l) J. Stow's Chron. and Dr. Heylin's Hist. Ref.

(m) Hist. Ref. p. 159.



that which had been done, in order to her Advancement to the Royal Throne. But (the Doctor adds) the Lady Jane was no Lawful Queen; she had no Consent of the States, no Recognition by Act of Parliament, as all those Kings have had, whose Royal Authority has been own'd by the Laws, without an Hereditary Title. By this Answer the Doctor has plainly alter'd the State of the Question: Hitherto he had laid it down for Law, that whoever was in Possession, was a Lawful King; now it seems, that is not enough; but the Consent of the States, and Recognition in Parliament is necessary. I am not now at Leisure to dispute this Point with the Doctor: But if the Power of the People is so considerable, that they can create a Title, when they please, by their bare Consent; I am afraid, they can destroy one too, only by withdrawing it; and what any Republican can desire of the Doctor more than this, is hard to divine. Lastly: The Doctor concludes, *The Duke of Northumberland had no Right to plead this Statute; for being the principal Author of this Revolt, he was by the last Clause of this Act cut off from any Benefit of it. This Act was made for the Security of those, who submit to a King for the Time being, after he is establish'd; not for those, that overturn Governments; who whatever they may plead for themselves, it can never be the Eleventh of Henry VII.* Here we have the Doctor's Confession, that whoever are instrumental and active in putting the Lawful Heir from his Right, may be truly term'd *Revolters*; and consequently cannot claim any Benefit from this Statute. So that had the Lady Jane reign'd as many Years, as she did Days; and had Queen Mary at last forced her from the Throne; the Duke of Northumberland would have been still in the same Danger, and liable to be punish'd as a Revolver. This, by the Doctor's Leave, is such a Blow to the Power of Kings *de Facto*, as could not well be expected from their professed Advocate; for now it seems, those Persons, to whom they owed most, are least capable of their Protection; and their best Friends must unavoidably be in the worst Condition: For whenever the Heir shall recover his Right, there is no Law to shelter from his Resentments such as oppos'd his Claim, and lent their Assistance to his Enemy. And who can tell, upon such a Revolution, how great a Number of Subjects may be comprehended under the Name of *Revolters*? Whoever took up Arms for



for him, or assisted him with Men and Money; the Soldiers that fought for him; the *Divines* that made it Gospel; and the Gentlemen of the *Inns of Court*, that made it Law, are all involved in the Guilt of *Departing* from their Allegiance, by Virtue of this *Clause*, as the Doctor has expounded it. Thus we see, into what a narrow Compass the mighty Services, which were hoped for from this *Act* of *Henry VII*, are reduced by the final Clause of it. When the Government indeed of a King *de Facto* is settled, and his Enemies entirely subdued, the Doctor thinks it a just and wise thing to submit and swear to him; and will warrant it to be lawful by the Authority of this Statute; but for those that shall have brought about this Settlement, who may be sometimes the chief Gentry and Nobility of the Kingdom; they are all abandon'd to the Mercy of the Injur'd Prince, if he ever returns; and must be beholden to him, if they escape with Impunity. The Doctor's last Refuge in this Case can be only this; That by Virtue of a Pardon from a King *de Facto*, when he is thorowly settled, these *Revolters* will be safe against a King *de Jure*. But if the *Acts of Parliament* of those *Pretended Kings* were not of sufficient Force against *Edward IV*, it is to be feared, their *Pardons* will not be esteemed of better Authority. My Lord Chief Justice *Montague* (n) declares, that he would never have set his Hand to King *Edward's* Settlement of the Succession on the Lady *Jane*, if the King had not promised him a Pardon; which he knew would be good against Queen *Mary*, if she came to the Crown; because she could only have it as a *Purchaser*. From whence it is plain, he would not have thought himself safe, by that Pardon, if he had believed Queen *Mary* could have claimed the Crown, by Right of *Inheritance*. I would recommend this to the Doctor's Consideration. He is pleas'd indeed to add, (o) that Kings *de Facto* have actually given Indemnity by Parliament, to those that assisted them in obtaining the Crown; and he instances in the *Acts* of *Henry III*, *Henry IV*, and *Henry VII*, which were purposely made for protecting those, that had been active in advancing those Princes to the Throne. But if *Edward II*, and *Richard II*, had ever recover'd their Thrones, does the Doctor seriously believe, those *Acts* would have been really available for

(n) See his  
Apology in  
Fuller's Ch.  
History.

(o) View,  
P. 47, 48.



the Indemnity of their Rebellious Subjects? I am persuaded, the Kings that made them, were never of that Opinion. The true Reason of these *Acts* was to prevent Vexatious Suits, and other Prosecutions by one Subject against another. For many Acts of Violence, and Outrages having been committed, upon the Account of such Invasions, which exposed the Doers of them to the Severity of the Law; the Injured Subjects might have had their Remedy against those Offenders, by *Indictments* for Murder, *Actions* of Trespass, &c. unless timely disabled by *Acts* of this Nature; which will be always necessary for the Adherents to *unjust Pretenders*, who depose Lawful Princes. But the Case is quite different, when Kings *de Jure* are the Invaders; for whoever assists them in their Quarrel, need no Act of Parliament for their Indemnity.

THUS I have fully consider'd all, that the Doctor has been pleased to urge from the Eleventh of *Hen. VII*; and by what I have observed upon this Occasion, the Reader will undoubtedly be surprized at the following Passage in the Doctor's *View*. (p) *Those who fought for the King for the Time being, wanted no Act of Parliament to indemnify them; nor had they any. And again: Did the King in Possession, or his Parliament, or the Parties concerned, ever think an Act of Parliament was wanting for those, who fought for him, against a Person out of Possession, whatever Title he had, or pretended to have? Can there be one Instance given of this, in all our Laws or History?* But afterwards he tells us, (q) *This Act [viz. 11 Hen. 7.] was made for the Security of those, who submit to a King for the Time being, after he is established.* The Doctor may try to reconcile these Passages, if he pleases.

(p) *View*,  
P. 47.

(q) P. 68.

Lastly, After all that has been said concerning the Meaning, and Authority of this Statute, may it not be doubted, whether it is now in Force? My Reason is this; In King *William's* Reign an Act was passed, which declares the Subjects absolv'd from their Allegiance, if the King of *England* should ever appear to be a Papist: Now this *Act* cannot possibly signify any thing, if *Subjects, who serve and defend the King for the Time being, do their true Duty and Allegiance*; as is affirm'd by this Law of *Henry VII.*

AND



AND now having had Occasion to mention the Case of Queen Mary and the Lady Jane Grey, I beg Leave to subjoin the Judgment of the Lord Chief Justice Hale upon that Matter, as not unworthy of the Reader's Observation.

(r) If the Right Heir of the Crown be in actual Exercise of the Sovereignty; suppose in one Part of the Kingdom, and an Usurper be in the actual Exercise of the Sovereignty in another; yet the Law judgeth him in Possession of the Crown, that hath the True Right; and the other is in Truth, not so much as a King de Facto, but a Disturber only; and therefore not a King within the Twenty Fifth of Edward III. This was the Case between Edward IV, and Henry VI. Altho' Edward IV. took upon him the Sovereignty, and was declared King in London upon the Fourth of March 1460; yet Henry VI. was in the Northern Parts, and treated as a King, and rais'd a great Army; which being subdued by King Edward IV, in the latter End of May, in the bloody Battle of Towton-Field; then, and not till then, had Edward IV. the total and quiet Possession of the Crown; and in November following held a Parliament, wherein his Title is declared, and the Commencement of his Reign enacted to be the Fourth of March before; and Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI, declared Usurpers. During this Interval, from the Fourth of March to June, Henry VI. was used as King, and yet was not so much as King de Facto; Edward IV, the Right Heir, being likewise in Possession of the Regality.

(r) Historia  
Placitorum.  
Coronæ MS:  
Vol. 1. c. 13:

The like was between Queen Mary, and the Lady Jane Dudley, who was proclaimed Queen at London, by Pretence of Nomination by King Edward VI; but held not that Title above ten Days. For the same time Queen Mary openly laid Claim to the Crown, and was also proclaimed Queen: So that both being de Facto in Possession of the Crown, the Law adjudged Possession in her, that had the Right, viz. Queen Mary; and therefore by an Act of Parliament (1 Mar. c. 3.) it is enacted, that Recognizances dated Anno Primo Reginae Jane, shall be allowed as good; which needed not have been, if she had been Regina de Facto, though an Usurper: Because Judicial Acts are not Diminutions of the Regal Revenue, 9 Edw. 4. 15. 11.

And if any shall say, that if Henry VI, or Queen Jane, had gotten the Victory, and Possession of the Crown, that possibly as much would have been asserted by them and their Parliaments



ments against Edward IV. and Queen Mary ; This is an Objection of no Value ; for I do not take my Measures herein from Events, which are various and uncertain ; but according to the true Right of Matters, pursuant to the Laws of England, as near as I can.

(s) See View,  
P. 20, 42, 45.

(t) Cases in  
Parliament  
resolv'd in  
Purbeck's  
Case, P. 9.

(u) View,  
P. 20.

It remains now to be consider'd, what Authority is to be attributed to the Opinion of Henry VII.'s Judges, concerning the Crown's taking away all Defects and Stops of Blood ; and whether it is of that mighty Advantage, as has been pretended, for Kings *de Facto*. The (s) Doctor indeed insists much upon it, and cannot forbear frequently assuring his Reader, that he reposes an entire Confidence in it. Let us now see, whether this Resolution of the Judges, as unanimous as it was, can afford any substantial and real Encouragement to the Advocates of Kings *de Facto*. In the first place therefore I observe, that this unanimous Resolution of the Judges was *Extra-Judicial*, and consequently of less Authority, than if it had been given upon the Bench ; (t) for when they deliver their Opinions out of Court, they do not hold themselves to be upon Oath ; and therefore, tho' two or more should be of a different Opinion from the rest, they do not refuse to sign the Resolution of the major Part ; and so it goes under the Denomination of all the Judges. The unanimous Opinion of the Judges is undoubtedly of great Authority ; but I am afraid the Doctor attributes too much to it, when (u) he makes it a Part of the Common Law of this Realm : For it may be remember'd, that the whole Bench of Judges were at first unanimous in the Case of *Ship-Money* ; and yet the Doctor knows, that Opinion was condemn'd as erroneous. I must beg Leave therefore to think it possible, that the Reverend Bench may sometimes err in their Resolutions ; and whether they did not in the Case before us, is now the Question. Secondly, Therefore I affirm, that this Proposition, viz. That the Possession of the Crown removes all Defects in Blood, and all other Impediments, is not universally true ; for if it were, then no Acts of Parliament for Disabling or Excluding any Persons from the Succession, could be of any Force, when such Persons are on the Throne ; nor in the least restrain the Subjects from paying their Allegiance to them. An Assertion, which highly reflects upon the Honour and Wisdom of those Parliaments, which have made it Treason to in-  
vade



vade and hold the Crown, against the establish'd Order of Succession; which have declared, that whoever should be guilty of such an Act of Violence and Injustice, ought to be esteem'd as no better than *Usurpers and Traitors*; and lastly, that it is the Duty of Subjects to take up Arms against such Intruders, as being absolv'd entirely from their Obedience to them. In King Henry VIII.'s Act (x) for Establishing the Succession, *Whosoever should* (x) 35 Hen. interrupt the Succession appointed by Law, or by the Last Will and Testament of that King, is adjudged a High Traitor. 8. 1. And in the 1 Edw. 6. 12. the following Words are remarkable: *Be it farther enacted, that if any of the Heirs of the King our Sovereign Lord that now is, or any Person or Persons, to whom the Crown and Dignity of this Realm is limited by Act of Parliament, made in the Five and thirtieth Year of the Reign of the late King Henry VIII, or the Heirs of any of them, do at any Time hereafter usurp, the one of them upon the other, in the Crown of this Realm; or demand, challenge, or claim the same, otherwise, or in any other Form or Degree of Descent, or Succession, &c. but only in such Manner and Form, as is declared by the said Statute; or if any of the said Heirs or Persons aforesaid, do interrupt, or let the King's Highness, that now is, peaceably and quietly to keep, have, and enjoy the said Imperial Crown, that then all and singular the Offenders, &c. shall be deemed and adjudged High Traitors, and shall suffer and incurr the Pains of Death, &c. as in Cases of High Treason.* From which Passage it is undeniably plain and evident, that Persons in actual Possession of the Crown, may be at the same time no better than *Usurpers and Traitors*, and liable to the Pains of Treason; and consequently, it was the Intention of those Legislators, that such Persons should be unable and incapable to hold the Crown, notwithstanding their being Kings *de Facto*. And the Truth is, if it was possible for any Prince to be under a Legal Incapacity of possessing the Crown, one would think Henry VII. was that Person: For first of all, as descended from a Natural Son of John of Gaunt, he was excluded by Common Law; and this Exclusion was expressly confirm'd by Act of Parliament. Secondly, He had been attainted in Parliament. And lastly, the whole Kingdom had (y) obliged themselves to take, accept, and repute King Edward IV. and his Heirs, to be Kings of England, and none other. But it seems,

(y) Rot. Parl.  
1 Edw. 4.



no Laws can have any Force or Authority against a King in Possession ; This is a clear Case, by Virtue of the Resolution of Henry VII.'s Judges ; and those Parliaments were very ignorant of their Power, which pretended to make Laws, to hinder Subjects from obeying Usurpers. Thirdly, Had it been a known Maxim of the Law of England, *That the Crown takes away all Defects and Incapacities*, according to the Doctor's Opinion ; we should never meet with Acts of Parliament, which approve of and commend Actions done in Contempt of it. Thus, for Instance, we find Attempts made by the Right Heir for recovering his Inheritance, justified as agreeable to the Laws of G O D and Nature ; and the Dispossessing of the Intruder, declared Just and Legal. Let the Doctor be pleased to cast his Eyes upon the following Passages, and he will be sensible, I do not impose upon him.

(2) Rot. Parl.  
1 Edw. 4.

(2) Richard Duke of York attempting by Force of Arms to recover his Right to the Crown of England against Henry VI, *used the Benefit of the Law of Nature, not having then any Lord above him in England but G O D ; and it was Lawful, and according to Law, Reason, and Justice for him so to do.* And it is farther declared, (a) *That the Taking of Possession, and Entree into the Exercise of the Royal Estate, Dignity, Reign, and Governance of the Realm of England, &c. by our Sovereign Leige Lord King Edward IV, &c. and the Amotion of Henry, late called King Henry VI, from the Exercise, Occupation, Usurpation, Intrusion, Reign, and Governance of the said Realm, &c. done by our said Lord King Edw. IV, was, and is rightwise, lawful, and according to the Laws and Customs of the said Realm ; and so ought to be taken, holden, reputed, and accepted.* I may leave it now to the Reader to determine, whether such Princes could have a Right to the Allegiance of those, who might lawfully, and justly depose them ; and I am much mistaken, if the Doctor will find it possible to elude the Force of these Authorities. I had Reason therefore to say, it is not universally true, *that the Crown takes away all Defects and Incapacities* ; for then Kings in Possession could not possibly be Usurpers, or Traitors ; neither could it be ever justifiable to attempt their Removal from their Thrones ; which yet we see has been warranted by several Acts of Parliament. Lastly, The Doctor cannot reasonably imagine, that the Opinion of Henry VII.'s Judges should be of sufficient

(a) Ibid.



Authority to determine the present Controversy; for this is making a King *de Facto* Judge in his own Cause; who will not fail to interpret the Laws, as they may best serve his Purpose. At this rate, I confess, the Doctor is sure of gaining his Point; and he may be confident there never was, nor can be in Nature, so strange a Creature, as an Unlawful King. I cannot however but wonder, that a Person so eminent for his Knowledge and Penetration, as the Lord Chancellor *Clarendon*, should so little discern the Evidence of this Maxim, as to think the Judges could not fairly apply it to the Case of *Henry VII.* His Words deserve to be taken Notice of, as a strange Instance of Short-sightedness in that great Man; and therefore I shall recite them at large. Neither will that single Precedent (says (b) he) of the Judges, in the Case of King *Henry VII.* when they declared the Act of Attainder to be void by the Accession of the Crown, (tho' if he had been in Truth the Person, upon whom the Crown had Lineally and Rightfully descended, it was good Law) find, or make the Judges of another Age parallel to them; till the King hath as strong a Sword in his Hand, and the People as much at his Devotion and Disposal; and then the Making and Declaring a Law, will be of equal Facility, tho' it may be not of equal Justice. Thus we see, how unfortunate this noble Lord was, in his Opinion of this Resolution of *Henry VII.*'s Judges; he calls it a single Precedent; he thinks it would hardly be followed by any other Judges; and plainly intimates, that it was not good Law, by reason of the Defects in *Henry VII.*'s Title. And this one Circumstance of its being a single Precedent, is enough to spoil the Credit and Authority of this Resolution; for may it not reasonably be doubted, whether the Judges of Kings *de Jure* (if ever their Opinions should be demanded in such a Case) would allow Kings *de Facto* the Benefit of that Maxim? And has not another great Ornament of his Profession (c) told us, That the Judges in Westminster-Hall do sometimes deny a Case, that stands single, and alone of itself? The Doctor indeed (d) assures us, that in Consideration of the Authority of this Maxim, the Act that illegitimated Queen Elizabeth, was never reversed by the Lord Keeper Bacon's Advice. But the Doctor knows very well, that Queen Elizabeth had a Title by the Act of Succession, and her Father's Will; whereas *Henry VII.* had no manner of Foundation, upon which he might build any

(b) *Hist. Rebell.* Vol. 1.  
Part 2. p.  
430.

(c) *Ld. Chancellor Nottingham's Argument in Mr. Howard's Cause,* p. 30.  
(d) *Vien,* p. 46.



(e) *Vien*,  
p. 78.

(f) Bacon's  
Henry 7. p.  
13.

any Pretension to the Crown: And the Question is not, whether this Maxim would not hold good, where Kings *de Jure* are concern'd; but whether Kings *de Facto* can legally claim any Benefit from it. I must not forget, that the Doctor afterwards (e) confesses, that an Act was passed to restore *Queen Elizabeth in Blood to her Mother*: It is true, he says, *this was only that she might inherit the Estate of her Mother's Family*, which I am not concern'd to call in Question at present. But the Doctor should remember, that Princes never thought it became them to slight Acts of Parliament made against them by lawful Authority; and therefore *Henry VII*, notwithstanding the afore-said Resolution of the Judges, took Care, (f) *that all Records, wherein there was any Memory, or Mention of his Attainder, should be defaced, cancell'd, and taken off the Files*; lest some time or other, if they continued in Being, they might rise up in Judgment against him; a manifest Indication, that he did not think it safe to rely upon the Opinions of his Judges.

THUS I have followed the Doctor through *Henry VII's* Reign, which seem'd indeed to administer much Consolation to him; and it must be confessed, that many Persons, who had long sought after Reasons to justify their Submission to the *Powers in Being*, fancied they had met with great Relief from some Passages, which happen'd under his Government; but I am much mistaken, if any solid Comfort can be derived from them.

(g) *Vien*,  
p. 74, &c.

I MIGHT now persuade myself, I am entirely at Liberty to release my Reader from any farther Trouble; every thing which occur'd in the Doctor's Writings, that had the least Appearance of an Argument, being, I think, fully consider'd by me. But the (g) Doctor having stepped a little out of the Way, to assert the Right of the Legislative Powers, to limit the Succession, (which may be very true, and yet Allegiance not due to Kings *de Facto*) I shall beg Leave so far to follow him, as to examine the Truth of some Historical Passages, with which he has thought fit to illustrate his Argument: And if I mistake not, this Disquisition will give me an Opportunity of clearing a Part of History, which has hitherto lain in much Obscurity. In this Undertaking I shall confine myself wholly to *Matters of Fact*; and therefore I shall not dispute the Authority of 13 *Eliz.* c. 1. which  
makes



makes it High Treason during the Queen's Life, and Forfeiture of Goods and Chattels after her Death, to say, that an Act of Parliament is not of sufficient Force to limit and bind the Descent of the Crown; neither shall I in the least question the Power of Parliament to entail the Succession: These Matters are as much out of my Way, as they are above my Reach; and therefore I am very well contented, the Doctor should abound in his own Sense upon them. All that I shall here observe is, that whatever Power Kings, with their Parliaments, may have *de Jure*, upon such Occasions, it is however true *in Fact*, that no Act of Limitation could ever yet effectually exclude the next Heir by Proximity of Blood; but sooner or later, Providence has hitherto so ordered it, that those who were first in the Line of Descent, have at length gain'd the Crown, notwithstanding all Parliamentary Provisions to the Contrary. I believe it will be allowed, that we have no Laws extant of this Nature, before that of (b) <sup>(b) 7 Hen. 4.</sup> Henry IV, in which he settles the Succession on his four Sons, and their Heirs, after his Decease; and it is observable, that as he was no better than King *de Facto*, so none but such stood in Need of any Acts of this Kind; for the Common Law provided sufficiently for the Succession of the Issue of Kings *de Jure*. The next Statute we hear of to this Purpose, is that of Henry VI, upon his Recovery of the Crown; in which he (i) excludes Edward IV, and gives the Crown to the Duke of Clarence, and his Children, immediately upon the Failure of his own Line; but this had no long Continuance, being (k) <sup>(i) Holinf-head's Chronicle. (k) Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4.</sup> annull'd, as well as that of Henry IV, upon the Succession of the Right Heir. Richard III. is said to have appointed the Earl of Lincoln, his Sister's Son, his Successor; and Henry VII. was no sooner placed in the Throne, but he also procures an (l) Act of Parliament, to secure the Inheritance to his Issue; but it is well known, his Son, by the Right of his Mother, had an undoubted Title, without the Assistance of his Father's Law. I come now to Henry VIII's Reign: This Prince having bastardized both his Daughters by (m) Act of Parliament, <sup>(l) Rot. Parl. 1 Hen. 7. (m) 28 Hen. 8. 7.</sup> found it necessary to make use of the same Authority, to render them capable of the Crown. In the Twenty fifth Year therefore of his Reign, another Act is passed, for the *Etablissement of the King's Succession*; in which the



(n) 28 Hen.  
8. 7.

Descent of the Crown is expressly limited to his two Daughters, *Mary*, and *Elizabeth*; and he is impower'd (as he had (n) been before) to give, dispose, appoint, assign, declare, and limit, by his Gracious Letters Patent, under his Great Seal, or else by his Highness Last Will made in Writing, and sign'd with his most Gracious Hand, at his only Pleasure, from Time to Time hereafter, the Imperial Crown of this Realm (for Lack of Lawful Heirs of the Bodies of Prince Edward, and the Ladies *Mary*, and *Elizabeth*) to such Person or Persons in Remainder, or Reversion, as shall please his Highness, &c. Now the Controversy between Dr. Higden and me, upon this Occasion, is, whether King *Henry VIII.* did truly observe the Direction of this Statute in his Nomination of Successors, after the Decease of his Daughters. That he was impower'd to do this by his Last Will and Testament, is not denied; and that a Will of his was produced and executed in some Measure,

(o) Preface to  
his Defence.

(p) Defence,  
p. 7.

is likewise not disputed; but however the (o) Doctor is positive, that *Henry VIII.* did not execute the Powers given him in Parliament, to nominate a Successor by his Last Will and Testament, sign'd with his own Hand. And in another (p) Place, he affirms it with much Assurance, That there was indeed a Will drawn for that Purpose; but it was never sign'd by the King, as the Act of Parliament expressly required, &c. But I see no Reason for this Confidence; and I doubt not, when the Reader has well considered the following Proofs, and Arguments, he will allow, that the Authority of this Will is much better supported, than the Doctor is willing to believe. In order to this, I shall shew, First, That his Will was admitted, published, and executed as a Legal and Good Will. And, Secondly, That the Doctor has not produced any Objection of Weight enough to render its Validity questionable. 1st, I say this Will was admitted, published, and executed as a Legal and Good Will; which is evident from the undoubted Testimonies of the following Records and Histories.

(q) 38 Hen.  
8. Vide Appendix, n. 6.

WE are assured from the (q) Journal of the House of Lords, that on the last Day of *January*, the Commons being sent for to attend the Lords, the Lord Chancellor then declared King *Henry VIII.*'s Death to both Houses, in full Parliament assembled; and then a large Part of the said Deceased King's Will (particularly those Clauses

of



of it, which related to the *Succession of the Crown*, and the Administration of the Government, during *Edward VI.*'s Minority) was read publickly before them, by *Sir William Paget* Secretary of State. Here then we see this *Will* is fairly laid before the Parliament, the best Judges of its Validity; and we do not find, that any Doubt arose in that Great Assembly concerning it. But on the contrary, we have the Authority of a (r) celebrated Historian, *That all the Executors appointed by this Will, did resolve to execute it in all Points, and to take an Oath for their faithful Discharge of their Trust.* And that the (s) next Day the Executors did take their Oaths most solemnly, for their faithful executing the *Will*; that they order'd it also to be enrolled, and every one of the Executors was to have an Exemplification of it under the Great Seal, ----- (t) and out of Conscience to the King's Will, resolv'd to fulfill what he had intended. Now, if we consider, who these (u) Executors were, and how eminent many of them were for their Integrity, as well as Quality; surely it will be hard to say, they wanted so much Judgment, as not to discern the Invalidity of this *Will*, or so much Virtue, as to execute what they knew to be a Forgery. But that I may not fail to give the utmost Satisfaction in this Question, concerning the Opinion which was entertain'd of this *Will* in *Edward VI.*'s Reign; I shall now lay before the Reader some remarkable Extracts from an authentick Copy of the *Council Books* of King *Edward VI.*, which will fully answer my Purpose.

(r) *Bishop of Sarum's Hist. Ref. Part 2. p. 4. B. 1.*

(s) *Ibid. p. 3.*

(t) *Ibid. p. 8.*

(u) *See their Names at the End of the Will, in the Appendix, N. 8.*

(x) *In the Name of GOD, Amen. Where it hath pleased our late Sovereign Lord and Maister King Henry VIII. of most Noble and Famous Memory, &c. by his last Will and Testament bearing Date the 30th of December, in the 28th Year of his most Fortunate and Victorious Reign, to constitute and ordain us, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Wriothesly Chancellour, William Lord St. John, John Lord Russell, Edward Earl of Hertford, John Viscount Lisle, Cuthbert Bishop of Duresme, Sir Anthony Brown, Sir William Paget, Sir Edward North, Sir Edward Mountague, Sir Anthony Denny, Sir William Herbert, Knights, to be his Executors, and to be of the Privy Council with our Sovereign Lord King Edward VI, until he shall be of the full Age of Eighteen, &c. We the said Archbishop, Thomas Lord Wriothesly Chancellour, &c. being all assembled together*

(x) *Council-Book, Edw. 6. Part 1. in initio.*

in



*The Hereditary Right of the*

*in the Tower of London, the last Day of January, in the 1st Year of the Reign of our said Sovereign Lord King Edward VI. that now is, have reverently and diligently consider'd the great Charge committed unto us; and calling to Almighty God, the only Giver of all Grace, for his Aid and Assistance in all our Proceedings, have fully resolv'd and agreed with one Voice and Consent, not only to stand to and maintain the said last Will and Testament of our said Maister, and every Part and Article of the same, to the uttermost of our Power, Wits, and Cunnings; but also, that every of us present shall take a Corporal Oath upon a Book, for the more assured and effectual Accomplishment of the same.*

*The First Day of February, being Tuesday, all the said Executors before written, assembled again together in the said Tower of London, and there herd the Will estsones deliberately redde from the Beginning to the Ending. And concluding, with one Voice, to adhere and stick to their Performance of it, did first take their Oaths to the King's Majesty, and after immediately sware to the due and faithful Observation of the said Will, as the Day before they had resolved.*

*Wednesday, Feb. 2. Item, The Lord Protectour and the rest of the Coexecutours then present, having the last Will and Testament of our said late Sovereign Lord deceased, made Request with oon Voice unto the Lord Chancellour of England, to cause the same to be Recorded and Enrolled in Forme accustomed. And thereupon each of them to have Exemplification under the Great Seal of the same, for the doing whereof the said Will was presently deliver'd by them to the said Chancellur.*

*At Westminster, the 24th of February; The Lord Protectour and others his Coexecutours being most desirous of their Part to see the Will of King Henry VIII. duly and booly accomplished and fulfilled, as to their most bounden Duties appertaineth: For their more certain and assured Proceeding in the Execution of the same, upon mature Deliberation resolved, that before they would proceed, the hole Number of Judges, Barons of the Exchequer, the King's Serjeants, Attorney, and Sollicitor shall deliberately peruse the hole Will, and frankly declare their Opinion, what the Executours may lawfully do, how and in what Form the said Will might be lawfully executed and performed. Whereupon all the said Judges, &c. being called into the Exchequer-Chamber, after the Opening of this Resolution to them, the said Will was redde from the Beginning to the Ending; And after the same was well debated among them,*



them, it was deliver'd into their Hands to be farther consider'd accordingly: Who eftsones assembling themselves together for that Purpose, and weighing the Will and every Part of it, as appertain'd, repair'd together to the Lord Protectour, and other the Coexecutours; and then by the Mouth of Sir Edward Mountague declared, they had thoroughly consider'd the said Will, and with oon Consent and Advice deliver'd their Opinion, how that Part of the Will then in question, might be executed, &c.

ON the 8th of March following, as an Instance of their great Care and Concern for this Will, the Lord Protectour and Council thought convenient, that the Last Will of their late Sovereign Lord deceased, remaining still in the Custody of the Earl of Southampton, should for the more safe keeping of the same, be bestowed in the Treasury of the Exchequer; and thereupon did give Order to the Lord Great Master, for sending for the same, which was done accordingly; Upon Receipt whereof, about Ten of the Clock in the Forenoon, in a Case sealed, it was first opened, and eftsones sealed, and appointed to be kept till the next Day; at which time it was order'd to be deliver'd into the said Treasury by the Hands of Sir John Godsalue Knt. to the Custody of the Officers of the said Exchequer.

Sign'd, E. Somersset, T. Cant. W. St. John, J. Ruffel, J. Warwick, Anth. Brown, Ant. Denny, W. Herbert.

Wednesday the 9th of March. According to the former Order, this Day about Nine of the Clock in the Morning, the last Will of our said late Sovereign Lord deceased, was deliver'd by the Hands of the Lord Protectour, in presence of the rest of the Council, to Sir John Godsalue Knt. who repairing with the same to Westminster, and bestowing in the Place of the Treasury, where he alledged the Last Will of Henry VII. to remain, brought for Testification of the Delivery thereof, a Bill written in Parchment, subscribed with the Hands of Thomas Danyel, William Walters, and John Lambe, Officers of the said Exchequer. These certainly are such Marks of Respect and Reverence, as could not possibly be paid to a Will, the Validity of which was in the least suspected.

IN the Year 1549. King Edward VI. having been conveyed by the Duke of Somersset to Windsor, by Violence, as was pretended; the rest of the Privy Council, remaining in London, wrote a long Letter of Complaint



*The Hereditary Right of the*

to the King, against the said Protector, dated 19th October; in which were the following Passages: *We trust, that your Highness of your Goodness will, without any Jealousy or Suspicion, think that most expedient, both for your own most Royal Person, and all your Subjects, that by the Body of your Council may be thought expedient; to whom, and to no one Man, your Highness most grave Father appointed, by his Last Will and Testament, the Care of your Majesty, and all your most weighty Affairs. ----- For the End of this Matter touching the Duke of Somerset; if he have that Respect to your Majesty's Surety, that he pretendeth; if he have the Consideration of his Duty to GOD, that his Promise and Oath requireth; if he have that Remembrance of the Performance of your Majesty's Father's Will, that to the Office of a Good Executour appertaineth, &c: Let him first suffer us to be restored to your Majesty's Presence, &c. ----- The Protectorship and Governance of your most Royal Person, was not granted him by your Father's Will; but only by Agreement, first amongst us the Executors, and after of others; Those Titles and special Trust was committed to him during your Majesty's Pleasure, and upon Condition he should do all things by the Advice of your Council, &c.*

*Subscribed by the Lord Chancellour, the Lord Great Master, the Lord Privy Seal, the Lord Marquis of Northampton, the Lord Great Chamberlain, the Earl of Shrewsbury, the Earl of Southampton, the Lord Wentworth, Master Treasurer, the Master of the Horse, Master Vice-Chamberlain, Sir John Gage, Mr. Secretary Petre, Sir Edward North Lord Chief Justice, Sir Ralph Sadler, Sir John Baker, Sir Edward Wotton, Mr. Dr. Wotton, Sir Richard Southwell, Sir Edmund Peckham.*

IN the 4th Year of this Reign Stephen Gardiner Bishop of Winchester was brought into Trouble for some Misdemeanours laid to his Charge; in which Prosecution the following (y) Interrogatories, among many others, were put to the Lords of the Privy Council, &c.

(y) These Interrogatories with the Answers to them are only to be found in the first English Edit. of J. Fox's Acts and Mon. p. 793.

1. *Whether you know, or have heard say, that the late King of famous Memory, willed him the said Bishop of Winchester, no more to be of the Privy Council with the King's Majesty our Sovereign Lord that now is; and omitted and expressly refused to have him named among other Councillours in his Testament, to be of the Council aforesaid.*

2. *Item,*



2. Item, *Whether ye know or have heard say, that the said Bishop, being asorenamed as an Executour in the Testament of the said late King, was a little before his Death, at his Declaring of his Last Will, put out by his Highness, and so by him refused to be any of his said Executours, &c.*

To these Interrogatories the Lord Paget answer'd as follows.

(2) *Touching the late King's putting the Bishop of Winchester out of his Testament; it is true, that upon St. Stephen's Day at Night, four Years now past, his Majesty having been very Sick, and in some Peril, after his Recovery forthwith called for the Duke of Somerset's Grace, for the Lord Privy Seal, for my Lord of Warwick, for the late Master of the Horse, for Master Denny, for the Master of the Horse that now is, and for the said Lord Paget, at that Time his Secretary: And then willed Master Denny to fetch his Testament. Who bringeth forth first the Form of a Testament, which his Majesty liked not, after he heard, saying, that was not it, but there was another of a latter Making, written with the Hand of the Lord Wriothesly being Secretary. Which when Master Denny had fetched, and he heard it, he seem'd to marvel, that some were left out unnamed in it, whom he said he meant to have in, and some in, whom he meant to have out; and so bad the said Lord Paget, in the Presence of the foresaid Lords, to put in some, that were not named before, and to put out the Bishop of Winchester's Name, which was done. And then after his Pleasure declared in sundry Things, which he caused to be alter'd, and enter'd in the Will; his Majesty came to the naming of Councillours Assistants to his Executours. Whereupon the said Lord Paget, and the others, beginning to name my Lord Marquis of Northampton, my Lord of Arundel, and the rest of the Council, not before named as Executours; when it came to the Bishop of Winchester, he bad put him out, saying, he was a Wilful Man, and not mete to be about his Son, the King's Majesty that now is. Whereupon we passed over to the Bishop of Westminster, whom his Majesty bad put out also; saying, he was scholed; or such like Term, by the Bishop of Winchester. And so passing unto the rest, he admitted all of Council without Stop, saving one other Man, at whom he made some Stick, but nevertheless upon our Suites relented; and so he was named as a Councillour. This all done, the said Lord Paget read over to his Majesty, what was written, and when he came to the Place of Councillours, reading*  
*their*

(2) J. Fox,  
 ibid. p. 815  
 1st Edit.



their Names, he began to move the King again for the Bishop of Winchester ; and the rest then present set Foot in with him, and did earnestly sue to his Majesty for placing the said Bishop among the Councillours ; but he would in no wise be entreated, saying, he marvelled what we meant, and that all we knew him to be a Wilful Man.

(a) J. Fox,  
ibid. 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.  
p. 819.

THE Duke of Somerset likewise (a) deposes, That Henry VIII. would not suffer the Bishop of Winchester to be named as Executour or Councillour in his Testament, tho' moved to it by Sir Anthony Brown, the Duke his Grace, the Earl of Warwick, the Lord Privy Seal, the Lord Paget, Mr. Herbert, and other being present.

(b) J. Fox,  
ibid. p. 820.

THE Earl of Wiltshire High-Treasurer of England, being examined, (b) deposeth, That he was present at the Opening of the late King's Majesty's Will, and found not the Bishop of Winchester named there, either amongst the Executours, or Councillours.

(c) J. Fox,  
ibid. p. 829.

Cuthbert Bishop of Duresme, being examined, (c) deposeth, That he did not know, that he himself was named Executour, unto such time, that the King was dead: Nor did not know, that the Bishop of Winchester was left out, till he heard the Testament redde, after the King's Death.

FROM which Passages it is observable, First, That the Will mention'd in these Depositions, in which the Bishop of Winchester's Name was omitted, was that very Will, which was executed as the Last Will of King Henry VIII. Secondly, That King Henry VIII. for above a Month before his Death, took great Care in settling this Will, in a very deliberate manner ; for it appears from the Lord Paget's Depositions, that he sent for that particular Copy of it, which he best liked ; that it was read over to him, and several of his Privy Council ; and that he then declared his Pleasure in sundry Things, which he caused to be alter'd, and enter'd into the Will ; And lastly, that all these Alterations were read and approved of by him.

BUT if after all, this Will was no better than a Forgery, how came Stephen Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, a Person of great Experience, Knowledge, and Sagacity, who was disgracefully excluded out of the Number of the Executors, and Councillors, and therefore would have been pleased with an Opportunity of invalidating the Will, if it was possible ; how came that Bishop, I say, instead of urging any Objections against its Authority, (which he

was



was sufficiently provoked to do) to presume to appeal to this very Will, against the Power exercised by the Duke of *Somerſet* as *Protector*? Which yet it is very evident, he does, in the Place cited in the (d) Margin.

LASTLY, When Archbishop *Cranmer* was earnestly ſolicited to ſubſcribe to the Order of Succeſſion appointed by *Edward VI.* we are (e) aſſured; he reſuſed to do it for ſome time, upon this only Reaſon; *viz. becauſe he had ſworn to Henry VIII.'s Will*; to which the reſt of the Privy Council return'd no other Answer, but this; *That they had done the ſame, and had as tender Conſciences as himſelf.* A good Proof, that neither the *Archbiſhop*, nor any other of the *Privy Council* knew, at that time, of any juſt Objection, that could be made againſt the *Will* of *Henry VIII.*; for it is not to be imagined, ſuch an Opportunity would have been neglected, of removing his Grace's Scruples, had it been then known, that the ſaid *Will* was liable to any reaſonable Exceptions. So that we have the full'eſt Evidence that can be deſired; that during the whole Courſe of King *Edward's* Reign, this *Will* was eſteemed of unqueſtionable Validity; at leaſt I may venture to ſay, there is nothing appears, either in the Records, or Hiſtories of thoſe Times, that can in the leaſt countenance the Suſpicion of its wanting any of the Requiſites of a Legal *Will*.

KING *Edward's* Death was no ſooner known to Queen *Mary*, but ſhe (f) claims the Crown, as well by the Teſtament and Laſt Will of her deareſt Father, as by Act of Parliament: An Error ſhe could not poſſibly have fallen into, had either her Friends, or her Enemies entertained the leaſt Jealouſy of her Father's *Will*. And the Truth is, if any Controverſy ever aroſe upon this Subject; or it became a Matter of Doubt, in the Courts of Judicature or elſewhere, in any Time of this Reign, whether *Henry VIII.'s Will* was genuine and valid; our Memoirs and Hiſtories are extremely defective, in concealing ſo important a Piece of Knowledge from us.

WE do not find indeed, that Queen *Elizabeth* did ſo much Honour to her Father's *Will*, as publickly to found

(d) J. Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, 1ſt Engl. Edit. p. 795.

(e) J. Strype's *Memorial of Archbiſhop Cranmer*.

(f) See her Letter from Keninghall in Norfolk, to the Privy Council. J. Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, and Holinhead's *Chron.* p. 1084.



her Right of Succession, in any Measure, upon it: But we are well assured, that some of her best and most knowing Subjects were of Opinion, that her Title from it deserved very well to be insisted on; which sufficiently demonstrates, that the Authority of this *Will* was then thought very good and effectual. Bishop *Jewell's* Testimony, I believe, will be admitted, as credible for this Purpose; which may be found in his *View of a Seditious Bull*, (p. 13.) in the following Words: *Was not the Crown of England due to Queen Elizabeth by Inheritance, and by Succession, and by the Laws of this Realm? Did not her Father warrant it to her by Will, as to his Daughter? Did not Queen Mary, by express Words, leave it to her, as to her Sister? Did not the whole Nobility of the Realm confirm it? Did not Queen Mary's Bishops kneel down before her, and acknowledge her to be their Natural and Lawful Queen, &c?*

BUT notwithstanding all these Evidences, the Doctor tells us, that many and weighty Objections were long since made against this *Will*, which to him seem unanswerable. Let us now therefore consider these mighty Objections, and see whether they so well deserve his good Opinion: It is not pretended, that any of these Objections appear'd publickly in Writing, till Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign; and even then, I believe, it will not be found, that any *English* Subject had the Confidence to give them Countenance. The Truth is, the *Scotch* Nation was highly offended with this Will, for Excluding the Issue of their Queen *Margaret* from the Succession to the Crown of *England*; and therefore, when they found the Right of the House of *Suffolk* openly asserted, which was done by one (g) *John Hale*, in a particular Discourse written expressly for that Purpose; they thought it then became their Zeal for the Interest of their *Royal Family*; to enquire into the Validity of *Henry VIII.'s Will*, upon which the opposite Title wholly depended: And the Issue was, that at length they fancied, they had made very happy Discoveries, which would be sufficient entirely to overthrow its Authority. What Arguments they thought proper to make use of upon this Occasion, they were very forward to publish; and we meet with them frequently in several printed Books of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign; and therefore, I confess, it was Matter of some Surprise to me, to find so knowing an Historian as the

(g) *His Book was written in the Year 1563.*



Bishop of *Salisbury*, reciting the common Objections against this *Will* out of a Manuscript Letter, as a Secret, which he alone had the Happiness to discover, (b) and which had been hitherto unknown: Whereas there is not one Circumstance in all that he has said upon this Occasion, but has been more fully urged and represented in the *English* and *Latin* Editions of the *Defence of Mary Queen of Scots*, (i) written by *John Lesley* Bishop of *Rosse*, by the *Jesuit Parsons* in *Leicester's Commonwealth*, and his Conference about the *Succeſſion*; not to mention *John Colvill's Palinode*, and another Pamphlet, entituled, *A Treatise declaring and confirming against all Objections, the Just Title and Right of the most excellent and worthy Prince K. James VI*, printed, as I guess, not long before Queen *Elizabeth's* Death. These Books being thus published in that Queen's Reign, and dispersed throughout the Kingdom, are a sufficient Proof, that his Lordship had no Need to have Recourse to a Manuscript Letter, to furnish himself with Arguments against King *Henry's Will*. What these Arguments were, and how well they deserve that Name, I now proceed to examine: And though the Doctor has obliged me to consider them only, as they lie in *Leithington's* Letter, and Sir *Thomas Craig's* Book of the Right of *Succeſſion*; yet I shall be so just to his Cause, as to give them all the Advantage they are capable of, from the Books before-mention'd.

(b) *Hist. Reformat. Part 1. B. 3. P. 349.*

(i) *The English Edition was printed in 8vo. Anno 1569, at London. The Latin was printed at Rheims in 4to. Anno 1581.*

1. IT is suggested by *Leithington*, and Sir *Thomas Craig*, that this *Will* of *Henry VIII.* was not signed with his own *Hand*, but only with his *Stamp*, and therefore was not good in Law; for the *Acts of Parliament*, which empower'd him to limit the *Succeſſion* by his *Last Will and Testament*, obliged him to sign it with his own *Hand*; which not being performed, the *Will* was of no Authority.

To this I answer, *First*, That it cannot well be thought the Intention of those Acts of Parliament, to restrain the King from signing his *Will* with his *Stamp*: And, *Secondly*, That the Law looks upon any thing that is signed with the King's *Stamp*, as of equal Authority with that which is signed with his *Hand*.

*First*, I say, that it cannot well be thought the Intention of those Acts of Parliament, to restrain the King from signing his *Will* with his *Stamp*. For from what Cause



Cause soever it might proceed, it is certain, that before the Passing of this last Act of the Succession, the King generally made use of his *Stamp* upon all Occasions; and whatever was thus signed, was universally receiv'd, and allowed to be effectual to all Intents and Purposes, as if the Letters of his Name had been particularly and expressly formed by his own Hand. I have seen the *Council-Books* of the 33d and 34th Years of his Reign, in which a great Number of Commissions and Warrants are mention'd to have had no other Authority, but his *Stamp*; and it is well known, before that time he seldom gave himself the Trouble of using a Pen. It was undoubtedly therefore more for his Ease and Satisfaction, to be left still to his Liberty of making use of his *Stamp*, as he had accustomed himself to do; and we are well assured, his Parliaments had too much Complaisance for him, to cross him in any of his Inclinations.

BUT, *Secondly*, The Law makes no Distinction between a *Will* signed with a *Stamp*, and the same Person's own Hand; but looks upon the former as of equal Authority with the latter. This we are sure is true in the Case of private Men; and that it also holds good in the Question now before us, we have the Judgment of *Henry VIII.*'s last Parliament; for the Commission, by which the Duke of *Norfolk*'s Attainder was passed, was sign'd only by the King's *Stamp*; and yet the Act of Parliament, which enabled the King to pass Acts by Commission, (k) says expressly, *that it should be sign'd with his Hand*. This plainly shews, that whatever was sign'd by the King's *Stamp*, was, in the Opinion of that Parliament, signed with his Hand; and therefore the *Journal of Parliament*, when it mentions that Commission, says, it was signed (l) *Signo manuali Regis*. It may indeed be suggested, that for this very Reason the Attainder of the Duke of *Norfolk* was reversed in the First Parliament of Queen *Mary*'s Reign; viz. (m) because the Commission, by which that Attainder was passed, was signed by the King's *Stamp*, and not his Hand. But we have a later and more

(k) 33 Hen. 8. c. 21.

(l) Les Lettres Patents purport le signe Henry Rex Manuel del Roy. Vide Dyer's Reports, Term. Mich. An<sup>o</sup> 1<sup>mo</sup> Mariae.

(m) Vide Journal Parl. 1<sup>mo</sup> Mariae, and Bishop of Sarum's History of the Reformation, Part 2. p. 257. B. 2. and Dyer's Reports, Term. Mich. 1<sup>mo</sup> Mariae.



remarkable Judgment given in Parliament, which may justly be thought sufficient to determine this Controversy; and that was in the Case of the Act, which appointed the *Abjuration Oath*, and also the *Malt Tax*, (if I mistake not) which were both passed by a Commission signed only by King *William's Stamp*, the Day before he died. Will the Doctor now say, these Acts were of no Authority, and that whatever was done pursuant to them, was contrary to Law? I am persuaded, he will not own this to be his Opinion. But if he will allow the *Stamp* of a King to be of sufficient Authority in a Commission of this High Nature; he will be very hard put to it to prove, that it is of no Force in the present Question.

2. It is said, this *Stamp* was not set to the *Will* by the King himself, nor by his Order; but *that after the King had lost the Use of his Reason, or was past Sense and Memory, one William Clark put the Stamp to it; which was acknowledged by the said Clark openly before Queen Mary and her Privy Council, and also the Parliament. And this was likewise attested in Parliament in Queen Mary's Time, for the Restitution of the Duke of Norfolk, by the Lord Paget. This we find affirm'd in Leithington's Letter, and Sir Thomas Craig's Book of the Succession; and the (n) Bishop of*

*We say then, that the King never signed the pretended Will with his own Hand; neither do we say it by bare Hearsay, or gather it by our former Conjectures and Presumptions only; but by good and able Witnesses, that avouch and justify of their own certain Knowledge, that the Stamp only was put to the said Will, and that even when the King himself was now dead or dying, and past all Remembrance. The Lord Paget being one of the Privy Council with Queen Mary, of his own free Will and godly Motion, for the Honour of the Realm, for Reverence of Truth and Justice, tho' in the Fact himself culpable, and in a manner thereto by great Authority forced; did first of all Men disclose the Matter, first to the said Council, and then before the whole Parliament. Sir Edward Mountague also, the Chief Justice, that was privy and present at the said Doings; did confess the same, as well before the Council, as before the Parliament. Yea, William Clark, ascribed among other pretended Witnesses, confessed the Premises to be trewe, and that himself put the Stamp to the said Will, and afterward purchased his Charter of Pardon for*

(n) Bishop of Rosse's Defence of Queen Mary's Right to the Crown of England, Book 2. p. 98. Engl. 8<sup>o</sup>.



the said Fact. Upon which Depositions well and advisedly weighed and ponder'd, Queen Mary, with the Advice of her Council, to the Honour of GOD and the Realm, to the Maintenance of Trewth and Justice, and the Rightful Succession of the Crown, for the eschewing of many fowl Mischiefs, which might upon this Forgery ensue, caused the Record of the said forged Will, remaining in the Chancery, to be cancelled, defaced, and abolished, as not worthy to remain among the trew and sincere Records of this noble Realm. And to the same Purpose writes the Author of the Treatise, *Declaring the Right and Title of King James VI. to the Crown of England*, which I had before mention'd. Now it must be confessed, these Facts are considerable, and would be of great Weight, in putting an End to this Dispute, could they be well proved: But I shall now shew, that some of them are false, and the rest depend upon too slight an Authority to be credited.

First, I say, some of these Passages, which are related as certain Matters of Fact, are false. It is not true, that Henry VIII. was dead, or dying, or past Sense and Memory, when the Stamp was set to his Will: For this was done on the Thirtieth of December, which was a full Month before he died; and it appears from the Lord Paget's Deposition, (before cited) that there was no Part of this Will, which had not been duly and maturely consider'd by the King, while he had the perfect Use of his Understanding, four Days before it was sign'd.

Secondly, That the Stamp was set to this Will by one William Clark, without the King's Order, &c. is said without any manner of Proof by these Writers. And surely, in a Matter of this Consequence, they will not take it ill, if their bare Word is not admitted for Evidence. They tell us indeed, that my Lord Paget declared before the Council and Parliament, in the First of Queen Mary, upon the Occasion of the Restitution of the Duke of Norfolk, that the Stamp was set to this Will by William Clark, &c. But what Evidence is there for this? We have neither Record, nor History, no printed Book or Manuscript, besides what has been written by Gentlemen of the Scotch Nation, that affirms any thing of this Matter. What Occasion could my Lord Paget have, to mention the Will of Henry VIII, when the Duke of Norfolk's Attainder came under the Consideration of the Parliament?

What



What Relation had they one to another? Besides, this Lord was the first, that produced this *Will*, and read it in open Parliament, as undoubted and genuine: He swore, as an Executor, to perform it; and all along acted in that Trust, as one that believed it, of unquestionable Authority; and all this I have proved from uncontestable Records. Is it reasonable therefore to believe, that a Person of his Quality and Character, would have acted so base and dishonourable a Part? Does it any where appear, that he ever retracted his first Evidence? Or if he did, ought not a Matter of such Consequence to be as well attested, as what he had declared before in Favour of the *Will*? But nothing Satisfactory in this respect has yet been produced: Indeed the Adversaries to this *Will* have been bold enough to insist upon such a Retraction of the Lord *Paget*; and have also been vain enough to expect, it should be admitted as an undoubted Matter of Fact: But the World is not yet so complaisant, as to give Credit to the bare Affirmations of a Party, supported by no plain and legal Proofs; and therefore till we are better assured of the Truth of their Assertions, we must beg Leave to look upon them as unworthy of any Regard or Countenance. Surely, such important Transactions, had they ever had an Existence; might have been demonstrated from some authentick Instruments, preserv'd among the publick Records; and it is not easy to imagine, that the *Journals* of Parliament, and Council-Books, should pass them by without any manner of Notice; and yet we know, that nothing of this Nature is to be found in those Writings. After all, if it could be proved, that the Lord *Paget* did give in the Evidence pretended, in Queen *Mary's* Time, it may very well be a Question, whether this could be of Weight enough to overthrow the Credit of his former Depositions, in Favour of the said *Will*: For the Bishop of *Rosse* himself (o) confesses, *That if any such Witness, or Executor, had upon his Oath before a Lawful Judge, deposed of his own certain Notice and Knowledge, that the said Will was signed with the King's own Hand; in case he should afterwards contrary and revoke this his solemn Deposition, it ought not lightly to be discredited, for any such Contradiction afterward happening.* But I have fully shewed, that this Lord *Paget* did in King *Edward VI.'s* Reign, upon several publick Occasions,

(o) *Defence of the Title of Mary Queen of Scots, English 8<sup>o</sup>. B. 2. p. 101.*



Occasions, manifest his Belief, that *Henry VIII's Will* was good and genuine.

WHAT has been said against this imaginary Retraction of the Lord *Paget*, may equally serve, as an Answer to the Surmise, that *William Clark*, and the Lord Chief Justice *Montague*, did likewise appear as Witnesses against this *Will*: For all this is affirm'd without any manner of Proof; and is a Piece of History no where to be met with, but in those few *Scotch* Writers abovementioned; who were indeed truly worthy of Commendation, for the Fidelity and Zeal they shew'd in their Mistress's Cause; but were undoubtedly imposed upon in these Particulars. For surely it is a very dishonourable Reflexion on Sir *Edward Montague's* Memory, to say, he rejected the Authority of this Will in Queen *Mary's* Days, who was sworn to it in *Edward VI's*, and took Care to see it executed; and also upon a serious and deliberate Perusal of it, with the rest of the Judges, gave his Advice, how some particular Parts of it might best be performed, as I before observed out of King *Edward's* Council Book. These Actions were manifest Indications, that he did not then suspect the Authority of King *Henry's Will*; unless we are to suppose, he acted against his Opinion and Conscience, which we ought not to be easily prevail'd with to believe.

(p) *Defence,*  
p. 9.

AFTER all, I am sensible, I have not yet satisfied Doctor *Higden*; for he (p) tells us, *That what Leithington says, carries the greater Weight; because he appeals for the Truth of it, not only to Sir William Cecill, the Minister of State to whom he writes; but to several Noblemen then alive, who could not but know, whether what he affirms to have been done in open Parliament twelve Years before, was really done or not, &c.* Admirable Reasoning! I doubt not but Sir *William Cecill*, and the Noblemen appeal'd to in that Letter, did know, whether what was affirm'd there was true; but certainly it was no Argument it was so, because *Leithington* might easily have been confuted, if it had been otherwise: For surely Men may be confident in their Mistakes, and assert Things boldly against Truth, and yet be so despised, as to be thought unworthy of a Confutation. I am confident, this is the true Reason, that so little Notice has been hitherto publish'd, of the many notorious *Falshoods*, that fill almost every



Page of the Reigns of King *Charles II*, and King *James II*, in the Third Volume of *The Complete History of England*: And yet, for fear that the establish'd Reputation of the Histories publish'd with it, in the First and Second Volumes of this Collection, and the Bulk of the Whole; consisting of three large Volumes in *Folio*, should gain it any Credit in the next Age, as much as it is despised in this; and what is now known to be wholly owing to the general Contempt of the Book, should then by some Doctor *Higden* be improv'd into an Argument of its Authority; there is an *Examen Historicum* of it now preparing for the Press, by a (q) great Man, that had himself no inconsiderable Share in the Publick Affairs of the Time he writes of, and was an Eye-Witness of many of the Falshoods publish'd in this Third Volume of our *Complete Historian*. But to return to Doctor *Higden*. How does he know, that Sir *William Cecill*, and other Noblemen appealed to, did not shew Secretary *Leithington* his Errors in the several Points insisted on in his Letter? I rather believe indeed, that they did not do him the Honour to undeceive him in those Particulars: For Queen *Elizabeth* and her Ministers thought it a Piece of Wisdom (for many Years of her Reign) to conceal her Resolutions about her Successor; and therefore none about her were permitted to enter into Debates about the next Title after her Decease. But however that might have been, it is sufficiently evident, that Secretary *Leithington* was misinformed in some Particulars, which he mentions in his Letter; for when he leaves it to such, as are to claim after the Issue of Henry VII, to lay in Bar the Polygamy of Charles Brandon Duke of Suffolk; I must take the Liberty to charge him with a scandalous and unpardonable Defamation of that Noble Peer: That this Duke of Suffolk had another Wife living at the Time of his Marriage with Henry VIII's Sister, was indeed a Calumny too much credited by the Friends of the *Stuart* Family, in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign; but it was so groundless a Calumny, and so easily confuted, that the World was soon convinced of their Error, in giving it

(q) The Learned Author of the Reflexions on some Passages in Mr. Le Clerc's Life of Mr. John Locke, in the Preface to which he has already oblig'd the

World with a Specimen of the Unfaithfulness and Prevarications of this Pretended Complete Historian.



*The Hereditary Right of the*

any Countenance; insomuch that when the Bishop of *Rosse* wrote his *Defence of Mary Queen of Scots and her Title*, he was ashamed of so notorious a Falshood, and therefore refused to allow it any Place among his Objections against the House of *Suffolk*; which, had the Story been true, would have been of great Use and Service to him. And it deserves to be taken Notice of, that this Slander was never after revived by any Writer of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, (as far as I have been able to discover) till Father *Parsons* the Jesuit publish'd *Leicester's Commonwealth*, and his *History of the Succession*; in which Piece, he thought it became him to omit none of those scandalous Aspersions, which might help to create an Aversion to the Families of *Scotland* and *Suffolk*, that he might the better advance the Interest of the Court of *Spain*. In our Days indeed an eminent Writer has very surprizingly, by an unfortunate Slip of his Pen, rescued this Calumny from Oblivion, and given it a fresh Currency in his celebrated History. *I have seen it often affirm'd* (says this great (r) Author) *in many Letters and Writings of that Time; that all the Issue of Charles Brandon was illegitimated, since he was certainly married to one Mortimer, before he married the Queen of France; which Mortimer lived long after his Marriage to that Queen; so that all her Children were Bastards. Some say he was divorced from his Marriage to Mortimer; but that is not clear to me.* I know not how it came to pass, that his Lordship's usual Tendernefs for the Honour of *Henry VIII.* did not a little restrain him from so readily giving his Assent to so suspicious a Piece of History; for undoubtedly it may be reckon'd among the great Blemishes of his Reign, that he match'd his Sister to a Person, who had a Wife then living. Besides, had his Lordship been at Leisure to reflect thorowly upon this Passage, before it fell from his Pen, he would undoubtedly have found it difficult to believe, so remarkable an Occurrence could have been, either a Secret to all our *English* Writers, or omitted by them, had it been known. And, *Lastly*, It is Pity his Lordship did not consider, how many (s) Noble

(r) *Bishop of Sarum's History of the Reformation*, Part 2. B. 1. p. 176. See also Part 2. B. 2. p. 236. of that History.

(s) *It may not be unacceptable to the Reader to be informed, who the principal Noblemen are, who have the Honour to be descended from the Duke of Suffolk, and*



Families are injured, if what he has affirm'd should prove untrue; for it is not to be imagin'd, they should be insensible of the Honour of deriving a Legitimate Descent from the Sister of so great a King. I proceed now to shew, that I have not without Justice question'd this Part of his Lordship's History; which I am persuaded will be done effectually by the following Extract out of a Manuscript Discourse, written by Mr. John Hale, in the Year 1563.

*Against these Heirs of the French Queen it is objected, that they were not lawfully born; but verily this is a mere Slaunder, grown altogether upon Malice, and no Accusation made upon any just Presumption. For I beseech you tell me, is it like, or can any reasonable Man think, that if Duke Charles had had another Wife living, when he married the French Queen; that King Henry would have consented, that his Sister should have receiv'd so great Injury, that she should have been kept like a Concubine? Would his Council have suffered so great an Infamy to have come to his Majesty's Stock? Or would the Nobility of the Realme with such Triumph have honoured so unlawfull an Act? Wou'd the Common People, who many times be ready to speak Evill of Well-doing, have holden their Tongues in so manifested Adultery? Is it like, that in so long time, that the French Queen and the Duke lived together as Man and Wife, (that was all the Life of the French Queen) she should not have heard of it? Was it possible, that amongst so many Women, which dayly resorted to her, none would have told her of it? Or is it to be believ'd, that she, contrary to the Nature of all other Women, would have been contented, that another should have been Partaker of that Flesh, which she according to GOD's Word took only to be her own? Or can any Man think, that any Woman can be contented to live in mean*

*the French Queen; and therefore I shall here set down their Names in their Order, as they occur to my Memory. The first of this House of Suffolk, now living, is the Lord Bruce (Son to the Earl of Ailesbury) and his Sister the Countess of Cardigan; then follow the late Earl of Winchelsea's Sister, the Right Honourable Heineage, the present Earl of Winchelsea; all the Issue of the Lady Frances, late Viscountess Weymouth; the Earl of Burlington, and the Issue of his Father and Grandfather; the Children of the late Dukes of Queensborough, and the present*

*Duke of Somerset. All these are lineally descended from Charles Brandon Duke of Suffolk, and the French Queen, by their eldest Daughter Katharine. And it is also well known, that the Earls of Derby, for several Successions, reckon'd it as one of the noblest Instances of their High Extraction, that they sprung from the Lady Eleonore, youngest Daughter to the fore-mention'd Duke and Queen. So that the several Branches descended from them, would be too numerous to be easily called to Mind, and would take too much Room to be here mention'd.*

Degree,



## *The Hereditary Right of the*

*Degree, when she may be a Dutcheſs, as the Lady Mortimer might have been juſtly, if ſhe had been the Duke's Wife? Surely there is no Reaſon to make any Man to think ſo; then much leſs to report ſo. But ſuppoſe, that the Duke had had another Wife living, at that time he married the French Queen; yet forasmuch as He and She were married together openly, continued all their Lives as Man and Wife together, and nothing ſaid againſt them; and every Man took them for Man and Wife; and that the Lady Frances, and the Lady Elianor were not taken to be Baſtards during their Lives: Now after their Death neyther they nor their Children may, by the Laws of this Realme, be accounted ſo. Nec juſtum aliquando mortuum facere Baſtardum, qui toto tempore ſuo tenebatur pro legitimo, as appeareth by a Judgement given at Weſtmiſter in 13<sup>o</sup> Edw. 3<sup>ti</sup>.*

*But for the Declaration of the Truth of this Matter, and to putt out of the Heads of the People this fond Opinion and Talk, which is only moved of Malice, and cometh not of any certain Knowledge; and encreaſed by light Credit without Conſideration; and mayntained by ſuch as no doubt paſs ſo much upon the Trueth, as deſirous to ſatiſſie their froward Affections.*

*You ſhall underſtand, that the Duke of Suffolke, Charles Brandon, being in the Court, living ſole and unmarried, made a Contract of Matrimony with one Mrs. Ann Browne. But before any Solempnization of Marriage, not only had a Daughter by her, (which after was married to the Lord Powis) but alſo brooke Promise with her, and openly and ſolemply married with the Lady Mortimer; which Marriage the ſame Mrs. Ann Browne judicially accuſed to be unlawfull; for that the ſaid Sir Charles Brandon had not only made a Præcontract with her, but alſo had carnally known her. Which things being duly proved, and Sentence of Divorce, between the ſaid Sir Charles and the Lady Mortimer, given and denounced, he married ſolempnly the ſaid Mrs. Ann Browne: At the which Marriage all the Nobility were preſent, and did honour it. And afterwards the ſaid Sir Charles had by the ſame Mrs. Ann Browne, another Daughter, which was married to the Lord Mounteagle. After this, the ſaid Mrs. Ann Browne continued with him all her Life as his Wife, and dyed his Wife without any Impeachment of the Marryadge. After whoſe Death, King Henry having him in great Favour, intended he ſhould for his better Preferment have married the Lady Liſle, being a young Mayd, an Inheritour. Whereupon  
the*



the said Sir Charles was created Viscount Lisle: But that Marriadge by reason of her Youth took no Place. After this he was created Duke of Suffolk, about the which Time Lewis the French King dyed; and leavynge the said Lady Mary (Daughter to King Henry VII.) Widow; the sayd Charles Duke of Suffolk was sent into France for her, and with the Consent of Henry VIII. married her twice, first secretly in France, and after openly here in England, (as before is declared) and so they lived together all their Lives long as Man and Wife, and were so accepted and taken of all Parts, and no Person impugning or gainsaying of the same; for there was no just Cause. After this they had Issue between them; that is, the Lady Frances, and the Lady Elianor.

Against whom the Lady Powes, their Base Sister, in the Time of King Edward VI. alleged Bastardy; but yet notwithstanding that, they were both by the Laws of the Realme, and by the Canon Laws declared to be legitimate, and approved to be born in Lawfull Matrimony, so as no Man can say, they be Bastards. And if that they cold, yet at this present, because it was adjudged for them, that it was not so; and also for that they both be dead, and dyed taken as Legitimate; he ought not to be heard by Order of any Law in the World, if he wold object it against them.

THUS did this Gentleman long since wipe off the Asperision cast upon the Issue of Charles Brandon, and the French Queen; to which it does not appear, that any Reply was ever made; and it certainly had that Effect, that the Bishop of Rosse, and others the most Learned Assertors of the Title of the House of Scotland; never afterwards thought fit to urge this Objection. Leithington indeed, and Parsons have had so little Modesty, as to repeat this Calumny, at the same time that they confess, they had seen this Discourse of Mr. (u) Hales; but neither of them has pretended to shew, that he had misrepresented the Fact, or departed in the least from Truth in the Relation of it.

(u) In Leithington's Letter his Name is printed by a Mistake J. Halle, instead of Hales.

IT may be farther observed, that Henry VIII. expressly provides in his Will, that the Heirs of the Lady Frances and Eleanor (to whom the Crown was to descend after his Daughter Elizabeth) should be lawfully begotten; a Qualification, which therefore he may be supposed to have believ'd, was not Wanting in their Mothers. But if any should be so contentious, as to disallow of this Consequence;



quence ; or so difficult to please, as still to question, whether the Legitimacy of the Children of the Duke of *Suffolk*, and the *French* Queen, is sufficiently proved ; they may enjoy their Humour, without any real Prejudice to the Issue of the Lady *Frances* and *Eleanor*, who had undoubtedly a good Title by this *Will*, whatever the Birth of their *Mothers* might have been.

ANOTHER Objection against this *Will* is, *That the Original had been embezzled, and was not to be found.* This is urged by *Leithington* ; and (x) the Bishop of *Rosse* frequently challenges the Advocates of the House of *Suffolk* to produce it ; and even Mr. *Hales* himself (y) was of that Opinion, that it was destroyed in Queen *Mary's* Time, by the Enemies of the Protestant Religion. But they were all extremely mistaken ; for the (z) *Original Will* is still extant, and may be seen in the *Chapter-House* at *Westminster* : It was first indeed repositied, by (a) Order of Council, in the *Treasury* of the *Exchequer* ; where it continued till about 18 Years ago it was removed, with the rest of the Records, &c. into the Place, where they now lie, as a more proper Repository for them, if I am rightly informed. In a word, this *Original Will* has been often seen and perused by able Judges, by whom I have been assured, that the Letters of the *King's Name* are evidently formed by a Pen ; and therefore strictly and properly by *his Hand*, and not by his *Stamp* : They have likewise observed, that some of the Stroaks of the Letters are plainly uneven, as drawn by a weak and trembling Hand, in the Time of his Sickness ; and are manifestly distinguishable from those made by his *Stamp*, which is presently discerned at the first View. I will not presume to undertake for the Exactness of this Account, though I have good Reason to rely upon it ; but if the Reader has any Scruples, he may easily satisfy his Curiosity, by comparing the *King's Name*, as it is at the Head of this *Will*, with his Stamps ; many whereof may be met with in the *Cotton*, and other Libraries about the Town. From whence it is evident, how little the Court of Queen *Elizabeth* troubled themselves

(x) See his Defence of Mary Queen of Scots, p. 94, 102, 106, 117. B. 2.

(y) In his Defence of the House of Suffolk, printed in the Appendix, N. 7.

(z) A true Copy of it may be found in the Appendix, N. 8.

(a) I have before recited this Order, p. 189.



about the Dispute concerning the *Right of Succession* in the House of *Suffolk*; since they suffer'd such Mistakes to pass upon the People, without the least Contradiction, when it was in their Power to rectify them at their Pleasure.

AGAIN, we are told by the Adversaries to this *Will*, that the Witnesses to it were of no Quality or Fortune; and therefore not like to be made use of by a Prince upon such an Occasion: And they add, that it is no small Prejudice against it, that it was never proved in the *Spiritual Court*. But these are vain, and frivolous Objections; for of those that signed as Witnesses, the first was a Knight, three others were the King's Physicians, and the rest, Gentlemen that had good Employments about the Court; and therefore he gives each of them such Legacies in his *Will*, as in those Days were not thought inconsiderable. As for the *Probate* of the *Will*, whether or no it was performed according to the usual Forms in the *Spiritual Courts*, is a Point of no Moment; and therefore not worth enquiring after. It is enough, that it was laid before both *Houses of Parliament*; and that the Executors advised with the Judges, and other able Lawyers about it; who gave their Opinions, how it might be best executed, as a good and valid *Will*. Besides, this we are assured, that the Council required the *Lord Chancellor* to cause it to be recorded, and enrolled in Form accustomed; and therefore if any will still insist upon it, that it ought to have been proved in the *Spiritual Courts*; it will be expected, they should give an Instance of any *Royal Will*, that was ever subjected to those common Forms.

Lastly, It is objected, that the Earl of *Hertford*, and Lady *Katharine Grey*, (eldest Daughter to the Duke of *Suffolk*) being required to prove their Marriage in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, (b) and a certain Time being limited, within which they were obliged to produce their Witnesses, they were not able to do it; and therefore the Archbishop of *Canterbury* proceeded to a definitive Sentence, whereby the pretended Marriage was declared Null and Void; and consequently the Title from this Lady (who was first in Descent from *Charles Brandon* and the *French Queen*) was entirely defeated. But this Objection does not affect the *Derby Family*, which derives itself from the Lady *Eleanor* the youngest Sister.

(b) Camden  
Annal. Eliz.  
A. D. 1562.



(c) Dugd.  
Baron.

Sister. Besides, Sir William Dugdale assures us, (c) *That the Validity of the Earl of Hertford's Marriage was afterwards brought to a Tryal at the Common Law; when the Minister, who married them, being present, and other Circumstances agreeing, the Jury (whereof John Digby of Colshill in the County of Warwick Esq; was the Fore-Man) found it a good Marriage.*

THUS I have at large consider'd all the material Objections against the Validity of *Henry VIII.'s Will*; and, if I am not too partial to my Performance, I shall never be put to the Trouble of a farther Vindication of it. But for the Reader's greater Satisfaction, I have inserted in the *Appendix* to this Discourse, a genuine Copy of this *Original Will*, and also *Mr. J. Hale's Defence of the House of Suffolk*; by the Perusal of which he may be more fully instructed in this Controversy. I shall only now add, that as much as this Exclusion of the *Scotch Line* has been exclaimed against; there was a politick Reason for it, which will justify *Henry VIII.* in the Opinion of many Persons; and that was, because the Regency of *Scotland* had refused to marry their young *Queen* to *Prince Edward*, according to the Agreement made for that Purpose. This Refusal was so much resented by *Henry VIII.*, that it undoubtedly occasioned this Limitation of the Succession in his *Will*; not only for a Punishment for their Noncompliance; but rather as an Inducement to them to consent to this Marriage; since otherwise there was no Hopes of obtaining the Crown of *England*: And it may likewise be observed, that by their Obstinate Rejecting all Overtures for this Marriage, the *Scotch* drew upon themselves that bloody War, which was successfully managed against them in the Beginning of *Edward VI.'s* Reign, under the Conduct of the Duke of *Somerset*; for in his Declaration this is assigned as the chief, and, if I mistake not, the only Reason of it.

I MUST now hope the Reader will pardon me for detaining him so long upon this Subject, being a Piece of History very little, if at all known, and which must be allowed to be of great Consequence to the Point I am now upon. For the Validity of *Henry VIII.'s Will* being once established, it will inevitably follow, that King *James I.* ascended the Throne of *England* directly contrary to the Order of Succession appointed by several

*Acts*



*Acts (d) of Parliament*; and yet in the Act, which recognized him, it is expressly said, *(e) That immediately upon the Dissolution and Decease of Elizabeth late Queen of England, the Imperial Crown of England, &c. did by Inherent Birthright, and Lawful and Undoubted Succession, descend and come to the said King James, &c.* so that, tho' it is in Fact true, that several Limitations of the Succession have been made in Parliament, and Persons, who were entitled to the Crown by Primogeniture and Blood, have thereby been excluded; yet it is also evident, that no Precedents have hitherto been met with, of *Parliamentary Entails*, that have long prevailed against those, that claimed by *Common Law*. And it is not a little remarkable, that tho' Queen *Elizabeth* thought fit to make it *High Treason (f) for any one, during her Life, to affirm, that she and her Two Houses of Parliament could not make Laws of sufficient Force and Validity to bind the Descent and Inheritance of the Crown*; yet this very Queen, whose Wisdom is so justly esteemed Abroad, and admired at Home; whose Memory is so deservedly precious among all true *Englishmen*; and whose Example will be always looked upon as worthy of Imitation by her greatest Successors: This glorious Princess, I say, who knew very well, how the Succession was settled by her Father's *Will*, thought it no Blemish to her Honour, to discourage all the *Pretenders* of the House of *Suffolk*, throughout the whole Course of her Reign; and at last entirely defeated all their Hopes and Imaginations, by placing the *Stuart* Family upon the Throne. I speak not this out of a Design of commending her for any Violations of the Laws of her Country, which should always be esteemed Sacred by Princes themselves; and tho' perhaps she never had the Interest of her Kingdom more at Heart, than in this particular Action; yet I shall never pretend to defend her; if those, who are proper Judges in this Matter, shall think her chargeable with Injustice. I had before premised, that my Business was only to enquire into *Matter of Fact* in the present Point of Controversy, without any Regard to the

(d) Viz. the 35th of Hen. 8. the first of Edw. 6. c. 12. and 1 Eliz. c. 3.

(e) It is observable, that this Bill for the Recognition of King James I. as True and Rightful King of England, was read three Times the same Day in the House of

Commons. See the Journal of that House, 10 Jacobi. And this, I believe, was the first Time that such a Compliment was paid to any Bill.

(f) 13 Eliz. c. 1.



Question of *Right*; and in Pursuance of this Purpose, I have now brought down my Enquiries to the Reign of King *James-I*; and made it evident (if I may venture to speak with so much Assurance) that he succeeded contrary to several Acts of Parliament, by which he was expressly excluded. I have farther observed, that his Accession to the Throne was studiously promoted, and at last effected by Queen *Elizabeth* herself and her Council; and therefore I do not pretend to acquit her of a manifest Contempt of those *Acts of Parliament*, from which her Sister and she in some Measure derived their Right to the Crown.

(g) *This was in the Year 1561. Spotf-wood's Hist. of the Church of Scotland, p. 182.*

(h) Spotf-wood, *Ibid.* p. 181.

(i) Cam-den's Eliz. A. D. 1564.

(k) Cam-den's Eliz. A. D. 1566.

It may be now expected, since I have in a manner arraigned the Memory of Queen *Elizabeth*, for acting contrary to a *Parliamentary Entail*; that I should make good my Accusation by good Authority; and that I shall now attempt to do. Soon after (g) her Possession of the Crown, she came to this Resolution with the *Scotch* Ambassador, that if his Queen would abstain from using the *English* Arms and Titles, during the Life of Queen *Elizabeth*, she wou'd oblige herself and her Children, to do nothing in Prejudice of the Queen of *Scots* Succession. And when (h) *Maitland*, the *Scotch* Ambassador, pressed her to declare his Mistress her next Successor; she made Answer, *That his Queen might assuredly expect at her Hands, that she would never wrong her, nor her Cause, if it were just in the least Point*: And then she added, *I take GOD to witness, who heareth this Conference, that next myself, I know not any one, whom I would prefer to her, or who (if the Title should fall to be controverted) might exclude her*. These were early Significations of her Good-Will towards the *Scotch* Family, in the Beginning of her Reign; and, on the other side, she was so far from giving any Countenance to the Pretensions of the House of *Suffolk*, that Mr. *Hale* was (i) imprisoned for presuming to write a Defence of their Title, and Sir *Nicolas Bacon*, Lord Keeper, who was supposed to have assisted him in it, was long out of Favour upon that Account. Soon after, Mr. *Thornton*, Law-Reader of *Lincolns-Inn*, (k) was order'd into Custody for arguing against the Right of the *Scotch* Queen. And within a short Space of Time, finding the Party for the House of *Suffolk* were very busy, and bold in asserting the Claim of that Family;



mily; (l) she permitted the Bishop of *Ross* to publish his Vindication of the Rights of his Queen; in which he is said (m) to have been assisted by Sir *Anthony Brown*, Chief Justice of the *Common-Pleas*, and one *Caryll* an eminent Lawyer. 'Tis true, she took Care to let King *James* know, that while he continued of the Popish Persuasion, he must not hope for her Friendship; and even his Mother, as violent a Papist as she was, knew so well the Aversion, which the Court of *England* had against her Religion, that she (n) never thought it advisable in any of her Letters to her Son, to dissuade him from persevering in the *Protestant* Profession; and when she was laying her Head upon the Block, she sent this last Message to him; *That although she was of another Religion, than that wherein he was brought up, yet she would not press him to change, except his Conscience forced him to it; not doubting, but if he lead a good Life, and were careful to do Justice, and govern well, he would be in a good Case in his own Religion.* In Compliance therefore with the wholesome Counsels of his best Friends, he at length (o) declared himself openly against the Church of *Rome*; and thereby gained entirely Queen *Elizabeth's* Affections, who before had dispensed her Favours to him but sparingly, and with great Reserves. But as soon as she was assured, that his Sentiments in Religion became conformable to her own; she was not wanting in all proper Encouragements to him, to look upon the Succession as effectually secured to him after her Decease: And it is not a little remarkable, that her Chief Ministers, who had been most active in bringing the Mother to the Scaffold, were not afraid to continue their utmost Endeavours, to bring the Son to the Throne; so much more powerful was their Concern for the Interest and Welfare of their Country, than their Regards to their own private Safety and Advantage. King *James* therefore having now laid so good a Foundation, was no longer in Danger of a Disappointment; so that when Queen *Elizabeth* lay a dying, Mr. (p) *Camden* assures us, *He was the only Person*

(l) *Camden's Eliz.* A. D. 1569.

(m) *Camden*, *Ibid.*

(n) *King James gives this Account himself of his Mother's Carriage towards him, in his Premonition to Christian Monarchs.*

(o) *Camden's Eliz.* A. D. 1594.

(p) *Annal. Eliz.* A. D. 1603, and Sir *Henry Savill*, in his *Epistle Dedicatory* to King *James*, before the Edition of *S. Chrysostome's Works*, tells the King; *Perpetui charitate te, ut Filium, complexa est*

*thought*



thought of for her Successor; to whom the Heads of all Parties immediately (q) paid their Compliments, as the Prince whom the Queen always justly and heartily favoured. And both (r) he and Archbishop Spotswood relate it, as a certain Truth, that she declared him her Successor, before the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Lord Admiral, with her last and dying Breath. And no sooner had she expired, but her Privy Council (s) dispatched a Letter to King James, to acquaint him with it; in which they declare his undoubted Right, and promise to serve him with the utmost Fidelity; and the same Morning Care was taken to proclaim him King. Thus was King James at length placed upon the Throne of England, in Opposition to the several Acts of Settlement made against him; and thus was Henry VIII. disappointed in his Endeavours to exclude the Scotch Family.

I SHALL conclude this Head with the following Reflexion of Sir Walter Raleigh. (t) As for Henry VIII, what Laws and Wills did he devise to establish this Kingdom in his own Issues? using his sharpest Weapons to cut off and cut down those Branches, which sprang from the same Root, that himself did. And in the End (notwithstanding these his so many irreligious Provisions) it pleased GOD to take away all his own without Increase.

THE Doctor's last Effort to prove the Authority of Parliamentary Entails, is from the Succession of Queen Mary and Elizabeth: The first of which, (u) he says, claim'd the Crown chiefly by Virtue of the 35 Henry VIII, and She or Queen Elizabeth cou'd have no other Title to it. Both of them could not have a Title by Birth; and yet both successively ascended the Throne by this Act of Settlement. Both had been declared by Law illegitimate in the 28 of Henry VIII, and one of them was not of Legitimate Birth; and therefore could have no other Title to the Throne, but what this Act gave her. And soon after, the Doctor again assures us, (x) That

Regina; neque mente solum & cogitatione, sed etiam non obscuris sermonibus designabat Hæredem. Id quod eò fidentiùs affirmo, quòd non ex incertis aliorum rumoribus, sed ex ipsius hoc ore præsens acceperim, cum forte de tuâ majestate privatim, ut fit, sermo incidisset.

(q) Spotswood says, (p. 470.) Secretary Cecill had assured King James of his Service; and the Earl of Northumberland advertised him of the Queen's Sickness, and advised him to make haste to take Possession.

(r) Camden at the End of his Annals, and Spotswood, p. 171.

(s) Archbishop Spotswood's History of the Church of Scotland, p. 472, 474. This Letter is sign'd by the Privy Council, and many of the Nobility, (March 24.) in which they expressly acknowledge, that to his Right the Lineal and Lawful Succession of all their late Sovereign's Dominions did justly and only appertain.

(t) Sir Walter Raleigh's Preface to his History of the World.

(u) Defence of the View, p. 5.

(x) Ibid. p. 8.

Queen



*Queen Mary or Queen Elizabeth was certainly illegitimate, and therefore could have no other, but a Parliamentary Title to the Crown; And yet it is certain, that Queen Mary was brought to the Throne chiefly by the Assistance of her Protestant Subjects, who yet generally did not believe her of Legitimate Birth; and Queen Elizabeth was proclaimed by the Authority of a Popish Parliament, who as generally believ'd her illegitimate. Which shews, that both Protestants and Papists agreed in maintaining the Act of Succession, that was made the 35 of King Henry VIII; and consequently both believed the Descent of the Crown of England was limitable by Act of Parliament.*

I HAVE here again the Misfortune to dissent from the Doctor in most of the Propositions contain'd in these Passages. And first of all, I cannot agree with him, that these Queens could have no other Title, than the 35 Henry VIII; for the Acts of Parliament teach us otherwise, when they tell us, *That the (y) Imperial Crown descended to Queen Mary; and that (z) Queen Elizabeth was Rightly, and Lineally, and Lawfully descended from the Blood Royal of England:* If these Ladies did not insist upon their *Birth* among their other Claims, they might have good Reasons for that Omission; but surely the Doctor will not from thence infer, that they did not think themselves *Legitimate*. That they were both *Bastardiz'd* by Act of Parliament is certain; but if that proves any thing, it is more than the Doctor seems willing it should: For it will then follow, that neither of them had a Title by *Birth*; whereas he does not dispute, but one of them might be *Legitimate*; tho' he does not determine, which it was. But why might they not both be *Legitimate*? Let us a little enquire into the Reasons, upon which such an Assertion must be founded. The Marriage between King *Henry VIII.* and Queen *Katharine* was declared Null and Void by the proper Courts of Judicature, and the supreme Authority of the Kingdom; therefore it is said, their Issue must needs be *Illegitimate*: But the *Canonists* utterly deny this Consequence; for (a) they unanimously

(y) 1 Maria 1.

(z) 1 Eliz. 3.

(a) Filii procreati ex matrimonio nullo, quandoque legitimi censentur, nempe propter bonam fidem Alterius ex

Conjugibus. Can. ex tenore. Qui filii sunt legit. c. pervenit eodem Tit. Covarruvias de Matrimonio. P. 2. Tom. I. p. 221. Here we see bona fides in one of the Parties only is sufficient.



(b) 1 Ma-  
riz 1.

affirm, that Marriage contracted bona fide (notwithstanding any Impediment, which may afterwards be discovered) is sufficient to render the Children Legitimate; so that according to the Rules of that Law, (to the Decisions of which all Cases of this Nature have been constantly referred by the Practice of England) Queen Mary must be looked upon as lawfully born; for the (b) Matrimony of her Parents was contracted, solemnized, and consummated by the mutual Agreement and Assent of them both; by the Counsel and Advice of the most wise and gravest Men of both their Realms; by the deliberate and mature Consideration and Consent of the best and most notable Men in Learning, in those Days, of Christendom: And no Doubt or Scruple arose concerning the Lawfulness of this Marriage, till Twenty Years after, that is till many Years after the Birth of Queen Mary. And now, lest the Doctor should suspect me to be guilty of Partiality to a Popish Queen; or that I have advanced an Opinion never before approved of by any Learned Protestants; the following Authorities will, I doubt not, be sufficient for my Justification.

(c) Bishop  
Godwin's  
Life of Queen  
Mary, p. 157.  
Fol.

(d) To prove  
this Rule, he  
cites in the  
Margin several  
Places of the Civil  
and Canon  
Law.

(c) BISHOP Godwin lays it down as a Rule of the Christians, (d) That Matrimony contracted without any conceived Impediment (altho' it after chance to be dissolved as unlawful) is of such Force, that the Children begotten in such Wedlock are to be accounted lawful; and then he adds, if this Rule be admitted as true, Queen Mary was legitimately born.

(e) P. 31.

IN the late Reign of King James II. Dr. William Claggett, the very Learned and Judicious Preacher of Grays-Inn, publish'd an Answer to a Popish Pamphlet, entituled, T. W.'s *Queries concerning the English Reformation*. Among which the (e) following Query is observable. If Mary was Legitimate Heiress of the Kingdom; then Elizabeth was not, &c. This had been a Popish Dilemma, till of late Days; but now it seems the Doctor thinks it may do good Protestant Service; but I would intreat him to take Notice of Dr. Claggett's Answer; *The Legitimacy of Elizabeth* (says he) is plain, supposing the Marriage of Queen Katharine to King Henry to be void; but yet Mary, the Child of that Marriage, was not Illegitimate; because the Marriage was made without Fraud.

LASTLY, The present Bishop of Salisbury's Opinion may possibly be thought of greatest Weight; I shall there-



therefore here set it down for the Reader's Perusal. It will be found in his *Reflexions* on the *Oxford Theses*, relating to the English Reformation, (another *Popish Pamphlet*) in answer to an Objection against Queen Elizabeth's Legitimacy. (f) His Words are these :

(f) *Reflexion*  
on the *Ox-*  
*ford Theses*,  
Part 2. p. 32.

But in the last place it is to be consider'd, that here was an innocent Child in the Case, whose Legitimacy and Right could not be cut off by her Mother's extorted Confession: Infants are more particularly under the Protection of the Law; and therefore Acts passed against them in that State of Feebleness, have such Flaws in them, that they have always a Right to reverse them; so a single Witness, in such Circumstances as her Mother's were, could not be sufficient to disgrace and disinherit her; and the Confirmation of the Act of Parliament that followed afterwards, might have been a forcible Bar in Law to her; but could be no just one; for as a Bastard is still a Bastard, even tho' he were Legitimated by Act of Parliament, so a Lawful Child is still what 'tis, notwithstanding a Sentence of Bastardy confirmed in Parliament: And this is so true, and was so evidently the Practice of that Time, that even King Henry, in his Suit of Divorce with Queen Katharine, was willing to have his Daughter Mary declared Legitimate; because Children begat in a Marriage, are begotten bona fide; and so they ought not to suffer, because of the secret Fault of their Parents. And if this was yielded in a Marriage, where both Parents were, according to the King's Pretensions, guilty of Incest; it was much more just in this Case of Ann Bullen, even supposing her Precontract true; for her secret Fault ought not to blemish nor ruin her innocent Child. Another Instance that fell out at this time in the Royal Family, is very considerable; and because it is little known, I fancy the Reader will not be displeased to have it particularly open'd to him. Henry VIII.'s Sister, that was Queen of Scotland, did after her Husband King James IV.'s Death, marry the Earl of Angus; and by that Marriage she had a Daughter, Lady Margaret Douglas. Some time after her Marriage she fell to be in ill Terms with her Husband, and discover'd a Precontract he had given to another; and upon this she sued him in the Spiritual Court; and it being proved, the Marriage was annulled; but her Daughter was still held to be Legitimated; and was entertain'd by King Henry, as his Niece, and given by him in Marriage to the Earl of Lenox; of whom descended the Lord Darnly, that was King James I. of England's Father; and since he was consider'd to be the  
second



*second Person in the Succession to the Crown of England, after the Queen of Scots, this shews, that by the Practice of that Time, a Precontract even legally proved, yet did not illegitimate the Issue, that were begotten bona fide by one of the Parents.*

THUS we see that *Protestants*, as well as *Papists*, have asserted the *Legitimacy* of *Queen Mary*; notwithstanding the Nullity of her *Mother's* Marriage, and the *Act of Parliament* which declared her a *Bastard*: And if the Doctor should now wonder, how they could presume to entertain an Opinion so contrary to Law; all that I can say for them is, that they believed it to be an unjust Law, and therefore of no Force and Obligation, as contradictory to the common Principles of Justice and Equity, by which the Christian World has been govern'd for several Ages. And the Doctor may be pleased to take Notice, this was Bishop *Jewell's* Opinion too; for in the (g) Place before cited, he says expressly, that *the Crown of England was due to Queen Elizabeth by Inheritance, and by Succession.*

I MUST now follow the Doctor to his (h) *Chapter of Authorities*, in which he pretends to support his Opinion by that of our best *Modern Lawyers*. The Passages cited by him out of the three first, viz. the *Lord Chancellor Bacon*, (i) the *Lord Chief Justice Coke*, and the *Lord Keeper Bridgman*, have already received an Answer in the former Part of this Discourse, to which I beg Leave to refer my Reader; but for his farther Satisfaction I shall now shew him, that the two first of these great Authors

(g) See his View of a Seditious Bull, p. 13.

(h) View, cap. 6.

(i) It may be proper here to observe, that this Citation from my Lord Chief Justice Coke, (in the third of his Institutes, c. Treason) is of suspected Authority, upon account of the many Errors in that Chapter and Volume; for a Proof of which the Reader may be pleas'd to peruse the following Passages:

It was observed, (by the Judges) that in these Posthumous Works of Sir Edward Coke, of the Pleas of the Crown, and Jurisdiction of Courts, many great Errors were published; and in particular in his Discourse of Treason, and in the Treatise of Parliaments, *Kelyng's Reports*, p. 21. And again; There are many

Things in Sir Edward Coke's Posthumous Works, especially in his Pleas of the Crown concerning Treasons, and in his Jurisdiction of the Courts concerning Parliaments, which lie under a Suspicion, whether they received no Alteration; they coming out in the Time of that which is called the *Long Parliament*, in the Time of that desperate Rebellion against King Charles I. But certain it is, there are many Errors in those Places, Ibid. p. 49. To these may be added the Opinion of the Author of the Discourse concerning the Jurisdiction of Chancery, at the End of the Reports of Chancery, p. 2. 43. where he plainly questions, whether my Lord Chief Justice Coke was the Author of several Parts of the third of the Institutes.



are plainly against the Doctor in other Parts of their Writings.

It is a known Position of Doctor *Higden's*, and evidently maintain'd throughout those his Books, with which I am now concerned, *that whosoever is King de Facto, is at the same time King de Jure*; whereby that usual Distinction is entirely laid aside, as destitute of any Foundation from the Laws of *England*. But my Lord Chancellor *Bacon* is clearly of another Mind; for he (k) says, *that Richard III. was King in Fact only, but Tyrant both in Title and Regiment; and so commonly term'd and reputed in all Times since.* And in (l) another Place he tells us, *That though Henry VII. should obtain by Parliament to be continued King, yet he knew there was a very great Difference between a King, that holdeth his Crown by a Civil Act of the States, and one that holdeth it originally by the Law of Nature and Descent of Blood*: What can be more evident, than that his Lordship believed, in these Passages, that *Richard III.* was not *King de Jure*, and that *Henry VII.'s Parliamentary Title* was not of equal Force and Authority with one by Blood? (m)

AGAIN, Another Doctrine which undeniably flows from the Doctor's Principles, is this; *That whoever loses his Throne, must sit still contentedly, without using any Endeavours for the regaining of it; because the Person in Possession of it, is by the Laws of the Realm absolutely entitled to the Allegiance of the Subjects.* But his Lordship expresses the greatest Indignation imaginable against such an Opinion:

(k) *Life of Henry 7. p. 1.*

(l) *Ibid. p. 4.*

(m) *And what he says in another Place, is extremely remarkable to this Purpose: (In his Advertisement touching a Holy War, p. 43.) The Prophet Hoseas, in the Person of God, saith of the Jews, They have reigned, but not by me; they have set a Seigniorship over themselves, but I knew nothing of it. Which Place proveth plainly, that there are Governments, which God doth not avow: For though they be ordained by his secret Providence, yet they are not acknowledged by his Revealed Will: Neither can this be meant of Evil Governors or Tyrants; for they are often avowed and established as Lawful Potentates, &c. This Nullity of Policy and Right of Estate in some Nations,*

is yet more significantly expressed by *Moses* in his Canticle, in the Person of God to the *Jews*. I will incense you with a People, that are no People. Such as were no doubt the People of *Canaan*, after *Seisin* was given of the Land of Promise to the *Israelites*; for from that Time their Right to the Land was dissolved, though they remained in many Places unconquered. By this we may see, that as there are *Kings de Facto*, and not *de Jure*, in respect to the Nullity of their Title; so are there Nations that are Occupants *de Facto*, and not *de Jure*, of their Territories, in respect to the Nullity of their Polity or Government. And in his Charge against J. S. (Resuscit. p. 54.) he calls *King Henry IV. an Usurper.* Vide Locum.



(n) Considerations upon a War with Spain, p. 3.

Shall a Prince (says (n) he) that is dispossessed, not make War for the Recovery? No Man is so poor of Judgment as will affirm it, &c.

LASTLY, in his Case of the *Post-Nati*, he has this Passage; *That Allegiance continueth after Laws.* I will only put the Case, which was remember'd by two great Judges in a great Assembly, which was; *That if a King of England should be expulsed his Kingdom, and some particular Subjects should follow him in Flight or Exile in Foreign Parts, and any of them there should conspire his Death; that upon the Recovery of his Kingdom, such a Subject might, by the Law of England, be proceeded with, for Treason committed and perpetrated at what Time he had no Kingdom, and in Place where the Law did not bind.* Here we see Treason may be committed against a King out of Possession; and therefore his Lordship was not of Sir Edward Coke's Opinion, who thinks the King *de Facto* only is the *Seignor le Roy*, to be understood in all Statutes of Treason.

BUT Sir Edward Coke himself was not always of this Opinion neither; for in the famous Case of the *Post-Nati*, being required in the House of Lords to declare his Judgment in that Matter, with the rest of the Judges; Two of the Points insisted upon were these; *That Allegiance is after Laws; and that Allegiance followeth the Natural Person, not the Politick.* A prover ceo fuit dit, que si le Roy soit expulse par force, & auter usurpe, encore le Allegiance n'est toll, comment que le loy soit toll. These Words are very plain and clear, and manifestly shew, that Allegiance may be due to a King out of Possession; but it will be asked, how does it appear, that this was Sir Edward Coke's Opinion? I answer, Sir Francis Moore (o) tells us, it was; and we have no Reason to doubt of his Testimony. He (p) says, *The Lord Chief Justice Popham, the Lord Chief Justice Coke, and Chief Baron Fleming, did give in this Answer with one Assent; and that the (q) rest of the Judges did affirm the same, excepting Walmsly.* So that now we have not only my Lord Chief Justice Coke's Opinion for the Authority of a King *de Jure* out of Possession, but also that of the whole Bench of Judges; to whose unanimous Resolutions the Doctor at other Times is willing to pay so great a Deference. This Passage out of Sir Francis Moore's Reports, had been before objected to the Doctor, to which he has thought fit to make such a Reply,

(o) See his Reports in the Case of the *Post-Nati*, p. 798.

(p) Ibid.

(q) Ibid.

p. 805.



ply, as shews he had as little Respect for his Reader, as for his Adversaries. *This Remarker*, says (r) he, cites (r) *Defence*, Moore's Reports, where it is said, that *Allegiance follows the Natural Person of the King*. Here the Doctor stops short, and makes this shrewd Repartee, as if (says he) a King *de Facto* had not a Natural Person. But how can the Doctor's Adversaries help it, if Judges are sometimes impertinent; and Sir *Edward Coke* himself (the Doctor's Oracle) does not always speak Sense? For the Proposition here ridiculed by the Doctor, was Part of an Argument made use of by that great *Chief Justice*; and it is no otherwise applied by the Objector (with whom the Doctor was concern'd) than it was by the Judges themselves in *Moore's Reports*. Let the Reader be pleased to examine the Place, and he will find, that the Intention of the Judges was to prove, that *Allegiance may be due to a King of England, in a Country, where the Laws of England are of no Authority*; and in order to this, they lay it down as a certain Proposition, that *Allegiance is after the Laws*; because it follows the Natural Person of the King, not his Politick; that is, though a King of England should be out of his Dominions, where he cannot put his Laws in Execution, and do the Office of a King; yet he still retains a Right to the Allegiance of his Subjects: Is it not then clear, in their Opinion, that *Allegiance* does not follow Possession? And is not this a Point of Law destructive of the Doctor's Positions; and therefore fit for his Adversaries to urge against him? But the Judges proceed farther: They add, that if a King be expelled by Force, and another usurps, yet the Allegiance is not taken away, tho' the Law is: One would think now, that the Sense of these Words were plain and obvious; that by the King expelled, would be meant a King *de Jure*, because no other's Throne can be usurped; and that whoever possesses the Rights of the King *de Jure*, though he be styled King *de Facto*, is an Usurper in the Intention of these Judges: By no means, says the Doctor: By Usurper in this Place, you must not understand a King *de Facto*; this cannot be; because the Law is so far from ceasing under a King *de Facto*, that it is administered not only actually, but legally, &c. and therefore by another that usurps, must be understood a Simon Mountfort; a Lady Jane Grey; or an Oliver, under whom the Laws did cease; and no Judicial Proceedings were valid any farther, than

con-



confirmed. But the Doctor has here grossly mistaken the Meaning of the Judges; for, First, those Words *Allegiance n'est toll, comment que le roy soit toll*, (which the Doctor translates, *Allegiance does not cease, though the Law does*) are to be understood only with regard to the Dispossessed King *de Jure*, with respect to whom the Law ceases, when he is out of his own Dominions, and has not Power to execute it; and this appears plainly from the fuller Report of this Argument of the Judges, which I before cited from my Lord (s) Bacon; for he tells us, they gave it for Law, that if any particular Subject, who followed the King *de Jure* in his Flight or Exile into Foreign Parts, should conspire his Death; he might, whenever that King recovered his Kingdom, be proceeded against, by the Law of England, for Treason committed and perpetrated, at what Time he had no Kingdom, and in Place where the Law did not bind. This sufficiently explains, what their Lordships meant by the Law ceasing: For, Secondly, The Law could not be said to cease under those very Usurpers the Doctor mentions. Whatever Power Simon Mountfort had, he never would presume to use it against the Authority of the Laws of England; for then he must have lost all his Interest among the Barons, on whose Assistance he entirely depended: And surely, if the Lady Jane perform'd any Acts of Government, they were agreeable to the Laws of England; if none, how could she be an Usurper? The Truth is, though the Doctor here, for a present Turn, is pleased to put her in the List of Usurpers; yet in (t) another Place, where he considers her Case more deliberately, he tells us, *She never was in the Throne, and that, her Government was but in Fieri, she was not Queen de Facto.*

(s) P. 218.  
(t) View,  
p. 68.

I COME now to Oliver Cromwell, under whom the Doctor affirms the Laws *did cease*; though it is a Matter of Fact, that cannot be contested, that his Courts of Justice had no other Rules for their Proceedings, but the Laws of England; and he may as well say, he did not govern at all, as that he govern'd by any other Laws, than those of England. And this was openly declared before the House of Lords, by the Attorney-General,

and the rest of the Learned Counsel, in (u) *Baden's Case*; for having argued from a Judgment given in Oliver the Protector's Time, it was thereupon said, *That tho' it might*

(u) See the  
Cases in Par-  
liament, Rex  
versus Baden,  
p. 75.

be



be surmised, that this was an Opinion vented in evil Times; yet 'tis well known, that excepting their Criminal Proceedings, the Law flourished, and the Judges were Men of Learning; as Mr. Justice Twilden hath often affirmed upon the Bench, Well; but though the Law was actually administered by Oliver Cromwell, yet the Doctor says, it was not legally; and therefore his Judicial Proceedings were not valid any farther, than confirmed. Now here I am entirely of the Doctor's Mind, that the Law was not legally administered by Cromwell; but may we therefore say, the Law ceased under his Government? If we may, I know not how the Doctor's Three Henrys of the House of Lancaster can be acquitted of being Usurpers; for all their Judicial Proceedings were confirm'd by Edward IV, which the Doctor looks upon as an evident Proof of their Want of Validity. In a word, the Doctor's Kings *de Facto* are frequently styled Usurpers in the Laws of England, as well as Cromwell; and therefore since the Law has made no Difference between them, I shall never think it reasonable to believe, the Judges have done so in the present Case.

THE Doctor's next Author is my Lord Chief Justice Hale; but the Passages I have already cited out of his Writings, abundantly shew, that his Opinion was clearly against the Doctor; and the Reader will be very sensible of this Truth, by the following View of them, which I beg Leave to lay before him.

(x) 'A King *de Facto*, but not *de Jure*, such as were Henry IV, V, and VI, being in the sole and actual Possession of the Kingly Style and Government, is a King within this Act.

(x) *Historia Placitorum Coronæ MS. Vol. 1. cap. 13. touching High Treason in compassing the Death of the King, Queen, or Prince, in the Stat. 25 Edw. 3.*

'And in such Case, the Right Heir of the Crown sitting still in a private Capacity, is not a King within this Act, till he obtain the Exercise of the Sovereign Power. This was the Case of Edmund Earl of March, and Richard Duke of York, who successively were the Right Heirs of the Crown, after the Death of King Richard II, as being descended from Lionel Duke of Clarence, the third Son of Edward III; whereas Henry IV, was descended from John of Gaunt, fourth Son of Edward III, and younger Brother of the Duke of Clarence, as appears at large by the Statute of Edward IV, and the Book of Edward IV, where the Act is printed.



‘ IN the Thirty Ninth of *Henry VI*, *Richard Duke of York* made out his Title to the Crown, by his Claim in Parliament, which Title, notwithstanding the Objections offer’d against it, was allowed, and acknowledged; (*Vide Rot. Parl. 39 Hen. 6. n. 15. & sequentibus*) but it ended in a Composition, that *Henry VI.* should hold the Crown during his Life, and that after his Death it should come to *Richard Duke of York*.

‘ ALTHOUGH the Duke of *York* was recognized Right Heir of the Crown; yet inasmuch as by Accord in Parliament, *Henry VI.* was to hold it during his Life; and the Duke, during that Time, was as it were suspended from the actual Exercise of the Kingly Government; the Duke was not a King within this Act, during that Time; nor was he the King’s eldest Son, within the succeeding Clause; and therefore in the same Parliament Roll (*n. 24.*) there was a Special Clause in that Composition, that Compassing of the Death of *Richard Duke of York*, now made Heir Apparent to the Crown, should be High Treason.

‘ THIS Accord was broken by the Means of the Queen, and *Richard Duke of York* slain; whereupon his Son and Heir *Edward IV.* the True Heir to the Crown, assumed the Crown upon the fourth of *March*, which was the first Day of his Reign.

‘ IF the Right Heir of the Crown be in the actual Exercise of the Sovereignty, suppose in one Part of the Kingdom, and an Usurper be in the actual Exercise of the Sovereignty in another; yet the Law judgeth him in Possession of the Crown, that hath the True Right; and the other is in Truth not so much as a King *de Facto*; but a Disturber only, and therefore not a King within this Act. This was the Case between *Edw. IV.* and *Henry VI.* Although *Edward IV.* took upon him the Sovereignty, and was declared King in *London*, upon 4 *Martii* 1460, yet *Henry VI.* was in the Northern Parts, and treated as a King, and raised a great Army; which being subdued by King *Edward IV.* in the latter End of *May*, in the bloody Battle of *Towton-Field*; then, and not till then, had *Edward IV.* the total and quiet Possession of the Crown; and in *November* following held a Parliament, wherein his Title is declared, and the Commencement of his Reign enacted to be



be 4<sup>to</sup> *Martii* before ; and *Henry IV.*, *Henry V.*, and *Henry VI.*, declared Usurpers. During this Interval from 4<sup>to</sup> *Martii* to *June*, *Henry VI.* was used as King ; and yet was not so much as a King *de Facto* ; *Edward IV.* the Right Heir being likewise in Possession of the Regality.

THE like was between Queen *Mary*, and the Lady *Jane Dudley*, who was proclaimed Queen at *London*, by Pretence of Nomination by King *Edward VI.*, but held not the Title above Ten Days. For the same Time Queen *Mary* openly laid Claim to the Crown, and was also proclaimed Queen. So that both being *de Facto* in Possession of the Crown, the Law adjudg'd Possession in her, that had the Right, viz. Queen *Mary* ; and therefore by an Act of Parliament ( 1 *Mar. c. 3.* ) it is enacted, that Recognizances dated *An. 1. Reginae Jane*, shall be allowed as good, which needed not have been, if she had been *Regina de Facto*, tho' an Usurper. Because *Judicial Acts* are not Diminutions of the Regal Revenue. 9 *Edw. 4. 15, 11.*

AND if any shall say, that if *Henry VI.*, or Queen *Jane* had gotten the Victory and Possession of the Crown, that possibly as much would have been asserted by them and their Participants against *Edward IV.*, and Queen *Mary* : This is an Objection of no Value ; for I do not take my Measures herein from Events, which are various and uncertain ; but according to the true Right of Matters, pursuant to the Laws of *England*, as near as I can.

(y) THAT Lawful Prince that hath the Prior Obligation of Allegiance from his Subjects, cannot lose that Interest without his own Consent, by his Subject's resigning himself to the Succession of another.

(y) Hist. Plac. Coron. cap. 10. Concerning Allegiance, Vol. 1.

AND hence it is, that the Natural-born Subject of one Prince, cannot, by swearing Allegiance to another Prince, put off or discharge himself from that Natural Allegiance. For this Natural Allegiance was Intrinsick, and Primitive, antecedent to the other ; and cannot be devested without the concurrent Act of that Prince, to whom it was first due.

(z) ALTHOUGH *Edward II.* had a kind of pretended Deposing, and was pretended to have resign'd ; and his Son *Edward III.* took upon him the Kingly Name

(z) Hist. Plac. Coron. cap. 13. Vol. 1.



Name and Office ; yet in the Opinion of those Times, Edward II. continued, as to some Purposes, his Regal Character : For in the Parliament (4 Edw. 2.) Mortimer, Beresford, Gurny, &c. had Judgment of *High Treason* given against them, for the Death of Edward II. after his Deposition. (a) Neither was that Judgment grounded simply upon the old Opinion in Briton, that Killing of the King's Father was Treason : For though in some Parts of that Record (as in the Judgment of the Lords against Mortimer) the Words are, *Touchant le mort Seigneur Edward Pere nostre Seigneur le Roy qui ore est, &c.* yet in other Parts of that Roll of Parliament, he is styled, at the Time of his Murder, *Seignor Liege* ; and sometimes *Rex*, as N. 6. The Lords make their Protestation, that they are not to judge any, but their Peers ; yet they declare, that they gave Judgment upon some, that were not their Peers, in respect to the Greatness of their Crimes ; *Et ce per encheson de mordre de Seignor Liege, &c.* And in the Arraignment of Thomas Lord Berkly, for that Offence, the Record of his Arraignment is, *Qualiter se velit acquittare de morte ipsius Domini Regis.* And the Verdict, as it was given in Parliament, (4 Edw. 3. N. 16.) and the Record is, *Quod prædictus Thomas in nullo est culpabilis de morte prædicti Domini Regis Patris Domini Regis nunc, &c.* So that the Record styles him *Rex* at the Time of his Death ; and yet every one acquainted with History knows, that his Son was declared King, and took upon him the Kingly Office and Title, upon the 25th, or, according to *Walsingham*, 20 Januarii ; and Edward II. was not murder'd till the 21st of September following. I have been the longer in this Instance, though it were before the Making of the Statute 25 Edw. 3. that it may appear, that this Judgment was not singly upon this Account, that he was Father to King Edward III ; but they believed, that, notwithstanding the formal *Deposing* of him, and the pretended or extorted Resignation of the Crown, mention'd by the Histories of that Age ; yet they still thought the Character *Regius* remained upon him ; and

(a) The Doctor may be pleas'd to take Notice, that the following Words are a full Answer to what he has transcribed from Coke's Institutes, (Defence, p. 119.)

whereby the Error of that Chief Justice is corrected, and consequently the Doctor's Mistake in following him.



‘ the Murder therefore of him to be no less, than *High Treason*; namely, the Killing of him, who was still a King, tho’ deprived of the actual Administration of his Kingdom. ”

I SHALL now leave to the Reader and the Doctor to make their proper Reflexions upon these Passages, and try if they can reconcile them with his *View of the English Constitution*. I must expect indeed to be told, that the foregoing Extracts are taken out of a Book of my Lord Chief Justice *Hale*’s, to which the World is a Stranger; that where it is to be met with, is a Secret, and hardly possible to get Access to it; so that the Authority of these Citations depends entirely upon the single Credit of an unknown Transcriber; and consequently it cannot reasonably be expected, that much Weight should be laid upon them, in a Controversy of such Moment. To these Objections I can only answer, that I am well assured, these Citations were faithfully transcribed, many Years ago, from one of the *Folio* Volumes of the *History of the Pleas of the Crown*, written by my Lord Chief Justice *Hale*, which was then in the Custody of his Grandson, at his Seat in *Gloucestershire*: And this is all I can pretend to say for their Authority; with which if the Reader is not satisfied, I must be contented to stay for my Vindication till they are published, which, it is to be hoped, will be in a short Time. I doubt not however, but those that are acquainted with my Lord Chief Justice *Hale*’s Writings, will be of Opinion, that they sufficiently speak for themselves; or at least, that there are such Marks of Learning and Judgment in them, as evidently shew, they are by no means unworthy of him. But whatever may be the Fate of these Extracts, I would not have the Doctor imagine, that we are destitute of Proofs from other his Lordship’s Writings, to manifest his Disapprobation of the Doctor’s Notions. His (b) *MS. History, and Analysis of the Common Law*, is in many Hands; in which (cap. 5.) speaking of Right acquired by Conquest, he has these Words; *But still all this is intended of a Lawful Conquest, by a Foreign Prince or State; not of an Usurpation by a Subject, either upon his Prince, or Fellow Subject; for several Ages and Descents do not purge the Unlawfulness of such an Usurpation. That is, such Usurpers, though they may be Kings de Facto for many*

(b) This Book has been since printed.



## *The Hereditary Right of the*

Successions, yet do not become Kings *de Jure*. An Opinion directly contrary to the Doctor's. Again; (c) *The Manner of Acquest of the Regal Title or Dignity, is either a Lawful Acquest, or an Unlawful one. A Lawful Acquest of the Regal Title, is either, first, by Municipal Laws and Constitutions of the Kingdom, which is no other but Hereditary Descent, according to the Laws and Customs of the Descent of the Crown of England. An Unlawful Acquest, which is by Usurpation, is when a Subject shall invade the Right of the Crown, from him that is Rightful and Lawful Heir thereunto; and was done by King Stephen upon Maud; by John upon his Nephew Arthur; by Henry IV. upon Richard II; by Henry V and VI, upon the Line of York; by Rich. III. upon his Nephew. And herein is considerable, what Power the Law allows to such Usurpers, and what it denies. Here it is plain, the Doctor's Kings de Facto are called Usurpers; and though he says, the Law allows them some Things; that must be understood only of such Things, as are necessary for the Order of Government, and not at all inconsistent with the Rights of the King de Jure.*

THE Doctor has now done with his *Modern Lawyers*: And in Requital, I shall set before him some Opinions and Practices of such as are ancient; and that no proper Means may be omitted for his Conviction, I shall shew him, that the Laws themselves teach us quite a different Doctrine, than what he has advanced in his late Accounts of our Constitution.

It is a known Position of the Doctor's, which is visible in every Page of his Writings, (d) *That a King de Facto has all the Powers, Privileges, and Prerogatives of a King de Jure.* But the Practices of the great Councils in King Stephen's, and Henry IV.'s Reigns, sufficiently shew, they were of contrary Sentiments: For when the Bishops and Clergy, in a general Assembly, were press'd by King Stephen to secure the Succession to his eldest Son *Eustachius*; they absolutely refused it, as an Act of the highest Injustice to a Prince, that had a better Title. Is it not then evident, that the eldest Son of a King *de Facto* was not then thought to have a Right to succeed his Fa-

(c) Cap. xi. f. 3.

(d) *The Sovereign Authority of the English Government, as well Legislative as Executive, hath been ever acknowledged,*

*both by our Laws and Lawyers, to be lodged in the King for the Time being; and that the Allegiance of the Subject has been due to him, and to him alone. View, p. 52.*



ther in the Possession of the Crown? But nothing more clearly proves this Defect of Title in the Issue of Kings *de Facto*, than the Parliamentary Provisions made for the Succession of *Henry IV.*'s Children. In the fifth Year of his Reign, the Lords in Parliament swore to the Succession of his eldest Son, and his Heirs: This however did not satisfy him; and therefore two Years after, an Act passed for Settling the Crown on his Sons, and their Issue Male; and this was undoubtedly then looked upon, as a great Point gain'd; but still it was not to *Henry IV.*'s Mind; for by this Act the Female Descendants from him and his Sons, were excluded, with their Issue:

About (e) half a Year after therefore he gets the Parliament in a good Humour; and prevails with them to settle the Succession of the Crown upon him, and his Sons, and their Heirs; whereby their Daughters, for Want of Male Issue, were made capable of the Succession. Now a King *de Jure* never wanted these Parliamentary Settlements; the *Common Law* of *England* having effectually provided for the Succession of his Issue; and if *Hen. IV.* had been a King *de Jure*, that is, one that possess'd the Crown by Lineal Descent, and Right of Blood; as he would have had no Occasion for such Acts of Parliament; so we may be confident, none of that Nature would ever have been denied.

IN the 21<sup>st</sup> of *Richard II.* a Petition was presented to the Parliament, for the Restitution of the *Spencers*; and an Act pass'd accordingly; for which one of the Reasons now upon Record, was this which follows: viz.

(f) *Because Edward II. was living, and true King; and held in Prison by his Subjects, at the Time of that very Parliament of*

*Edward III. when the Judgment against the Spencers was declared good.* Now here we have an express Parliamentary Acknowledgment, that a King may retain his Authority after the Loss of his Crown; and that Laws made by the Usurper, who gets into his Throne, do not bind the Rightful Successor. The Doctor could not but be sensible, that this was an Objection of Importance; and therefore to give him his Due, he has taken some Pains to remove it. And,

First, (g) He says, *This Act of Confirmation of the Judgment against the two Spencers (Edward III.) was not de-*

(e) Rot. Parl.  
7 & 8 Hen. 4.  
f. 4. and Ry-  
mer's Acta  
Publica.  
Tom. VIII.  
p. 462.

(f) Rot. Parl.  
21 Rich. 2.  
N. 64.

(g) Dr. Hig-  
den's View,  
p. 58.

clared



clared void by the 21 Richard II. but repealed; and therefore valid, until repealed.

BUT this Answer will not do the Business; for from the Passage before recited out of the Records of 21 Richard II. I do not pretend to infer the immediate Nullity of the 1st of Edward III. from the Time of the making of it; but only the Invalidity of it, with respect to Richard II.'s *Right* to declare it void, whenever he pleas'd. And therefore it is not material to say, he never used this Power; for the proper Question is, Whether he had not a Right to use it; which we see was plainly confess'd in open Parliament. The Doctor may remember, I choose rather to say, *Acts of Usurpers* are voidable, than void; and therefore, tho' none of the *Acts* made by Edward III. while his Father was alive, had ever been declared void; yet it would have been still true, that Richard II. had Authority, as King *de Jure*, to exercise that Power; which sufficiently shews the Difference between a King *de Facto* and a King *de Jure*.

(b) *The grand Question concerning the Bishop's Right*, p. 83.

Secondly, The Doctor urges, that the 21 Richard II. was repealed by the 1 Henry IV. To which Answer the Learned Bishop *Stillington*, some while since, was contented to make the following Reply. (b) *The Parliament of 21 Richard II. was not*, says he, *legally repealed; for Richard II. was alive, and in Prison, when Henry IV. repealed the Parliament of 21 Richard II.* And besides this, 1 Henry IV. was declared void by the 1 Edward IV.

(i) Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4.

For in that Parliament, (i) *it is ordained, and declared, and established, that all Statutes, Acts, and Ordinances heretofore made, in and for the Hurt, Destruction of the Right and Title of the late King Richard, and against his Royal Dignity and Governance, &c. shall be void, and be taken, holden, and reputed void, and for nought, adnulled, repealed, revoked, and of no Force, Value, or Effect.* Now certainly it cannot be denied, but the Repealing of the whole Parliament of the 21 Richard II, and that during the Time of his Imprisonment, was an *Act* against his *Right, Title, Royal Dignity, and Governance*; and consequently it is *adnulled* by the Words of the Record now recited.

I PROCEED now to put the Doctor in mind of some other Declarations in Parliament, no less clear and expressive against his Notions of our *Constitution*. It is an evident Consequence, which necessarily flows from the Doctor's



ctor's Positions, that the Dipossess'd King cannot justly make War upon the Usurper of his Dominions, for the Recovery of them; that he has no Right to the Allegiance of the Inhabitants of those Countries; and consequently, that for them to assist him in such Attempts, is downright Rebellion; and renders them obnoxious to the Pains and Penalties of it. But the direct Contrary is asserted in the Records of Parliament, which I humbly recommend to the Doctor's Consideration, in the ensuing Passages.

WHEN Richard Duke of York had been attainted by Henry VI. at Coventry; the Parliament Roll (k) says, *That the said Noble Prince Richard Duke of York, using the Benefice of the Law of Nature, and sufficiently accompanied for his Defence and Recovery of his Right to the Crown of this Realm, came thereunto, not then having any Lord therein above him, but GOD; and in the Time of a Parliament holden by the said Henry, late called King Henry VI, the 6th Day of October, the 29th Year of his said Usurped Reign; intended to use his Right, and to enter into the Exercise of the Royal Power, &c. as it was Lawful, and according to Law, Reason, and Justice for him so to do. And thereupon shew'd, open'd, declared, and proved his Right and Title indefeasible, whereunto it could not be answer'd, &c. And in the same Roll, (Sect. 10.) it is affirm'd, That the Commons having evident Knowledge, that King Edward IV. was in Right, from the Death of his Father, very just King of the Realm of England; and on the 4th Day of March in lawful Possession of the same; did desire it might be enacted, That the Taking of Possession, and Entree into the Exercise of the Royal Estate, Dignity, Reign, and Governance of the said Realme of England, and Lordship of Ireland, of our said Sovereign Liege Lord King Edward IV. the said 4th Day of March, and the Amotion of the said Henry, late called King Henry VI. from the Exercise, Occupation, Usurpation, Intrusion, Reign, and Governance of the same, done by our said Sovereign, and Liege Lord King Edward IV, the said 4th Day of March, was, and is rightwise, lawful, and according to the Laws, and Customs of the said Realm; and so ought to be taken, holden, reputed, and accepted. And a little after, (Sect. 32.) it is farther added; Where certain Persons of evil, riotous, and seditious Disposition, joyed in Rumour, and rebellious Novelrys, adhering to Henry IV, late in Deed, and not of Right King of*

England,

(k) Rot. Parl.  
1 Edw. 4.  
Sect. 13.



*The Hereditary Right of the*

England, after his *unrighteous, unlawful, and detestable Usurpation, and Intrusion, against his Faith, and Ligeance, upon King Richard II. his (l) righteous, true, and natural Liege Lord, tyrannously murdered, with great Cruelte, and horrible Violence, in an outragious heady Fury, the Right Noble, and Worthy Lords John Mountague late Earl of Salisbury, and Thomas late Lord Le Despenser, and other true Subjects, and Liege Men of the said King Richard, after his Decease, continuing their Faith, and Ligeance, according to their Duty to GOD, and to the Laws, and Customs of the Realm of England, to Edmund Mortimer, then Earl of March, next Heir of Blood of the same King Richard, and in Right after his Decease to have succeeded as True, and Righteous King, &c. And whereas Judgment was given against them in a pretended Parliament, &c; it is ordeined, that the seid Judgment be annulled and void. And to the same purpose is this, which follows: (m) The Petition of Thomas Lumley Knt. Cosin and Heir to Rauf Lumley Kat. &c. sheweth, That where the said Rauf and other were cruelly murdered and slain by Henry IV, late in Deed, and not of Right King of England, for the true Faith, Duty, and Ligeance, that they bore to the Right Noble Prince King Richard II. in his Days, and after his Decease, unto Edmund Mortimer Earl of March, next Heir to the seid King Richard, &c. and that in a Parliament holden the 2d Year of the seid Usurped Reign, &c. a Judgment of Treason was given against the seid Rauf, &c. Wherefore please it your Highness to stablysh and enact the seid Judgment to be void, &c. Which was done accordingly; that Petition being read in open Parliament, and by the Assent of the Lords and Commons approved of by the King.*

I AM persuaded, had the Doctor taken Notice of these Passages in our Records, (for he must allow me to believe, they escaped his Observation) he had entertain'd different Thoughts of our *Constitution* from those, which he has been pleas'd to publish; and yet a Person but moderately skilled in our Laws, will be able to make many Collections from them to the same purpose.

(l) From whence it appears, how true it is, what the Doctor has affirmed, That altho' Edward IV. called the Three *Henrys* no more than Kings in Deed, yet he

doth not pretend, that his Ancestors were Kings of Right, whilst the Three *Henrys* were Kings in Deed. *View*, p. 52.

(m) Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4. Sect. 37.



It is a Maxim of the Law of England, (n) *That the King cannot be in a worse Condition than a Private Subject*; that is, it cannot be supposed, that the Law has taken less Care of his Rights, than of those of his Subjects: Now in the Case of Private Men nothing is more remarkable, than the great Concern of our Laws, to secure their Properties, and to procure them Justice and Satisfaction, when they are wronged; and therefore there is not a more established Rule in Judicial Proceedings, than this, that the Law favoureth Right, even before Possession; upon which a (o) Gentleman of eminent Knowledge in his Profession, has left us the following Comment. *When two are in an House or other Tenements, and one lays claim by one Title, the other by another Title; the (p) Law adjudgeth him in Possession, that hath a Right to the Tenements.* We are in Justice therefore bound to believe, according to the Rule before mention'd, that the King's Rights are at least as sacred in the Eye of the Law, as the Properties of Subjects; and consequently, that the Law cannot possibly countenance the Doctor's Positions, which manifestly favour *Wrong against Right*.

ONE would think, if the Doctor's Notions were at any time in Esteem, we should meet with some Proofs of it in *Henry VI.* and *Edward IV.*'s Reigns, when Subjects had most occasion to make use of them in those frequent Turns and Revolutions of Affairs; yet nothing to this purpose has he been hitherto able to produce, from the Histories of those Times; but I think I may say, we have good Evidence to shew, that they were slighted and condemn'd even by Kings *de Facto* themselves, and their Parties. When *Henry VI.* recover'd Possession of the Kingdom, he treated those that had adhered to *Edward IV.* as Traitors and Rebels; he reversed all the *Acts* of that Prince, as illegal, and of no Authority; and whenever he had occasion to mention him, it is in no better Terms, than those of *Traitor* and *Usurper*; (q) he styles him his *Great Rebel*, who had lately possessed the Crown and Regal Dignity by *Usurpation*, and was only *de Facto* and

(n) *Tear-Books*, 4 *Edw. 4.* Term. Pasch.  
4 and 9 *Edw. 4.* 2. Term. Pasch.

(o) *Sir Hen. Finch on Law*. B. 1. c. 3.  
p. 29, 45.

(p) *It is observable, that my Lord Chief*

*Justice Hale applies this Rule to the Case of King de Jure and de Facto. See before*, p. 222.

(q) *Rymer. Acta Publica*. Tom. II.  
p. 680, 696, 705, 706.



(r) Rot. Parl.  
1 Hen. 7.

*not de Jure King.* And (r) in the 1st of Henry VII. it is declared in Parliament, that Henry VI. had been attainted of High-Treason, contrary to due Allegiance. Then it seems Edward IV., even whilst he was upon the Throne, owed Allegiance to Henry VI. when he was out of it; a Doctrine utterly inconsistent with what the Doctor teaches us. Let us now see, whether it may be discover'd, from the Behaviour or Writings of any of the Friends and Adherents to Henry VI., that they were influenced by such Principles, as the Doctor commends. And I shall particularly take Notice of Sir John Fortescue, and Dr. Morton, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Chancellor, and Cardinal; Men eminent in their Generations, for their Wisdom, and Knowledge of our Constitution.

(s) Sir John Fortescue was attainted with many others, for assisting Henry 6. in the Battle of Towton-Field. Vide Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4. f. 20.

SIR John Fortescue was Lord Chief Justice of England, under Henry VI., when that Prince was driven from his Throne by Edward IV.; but no sooner did that Calamity befall his Master, and the fatal Battle of Towton-Field (in which Sir John was (s) present) had fixed the Crown on Edward's Head, but he retired out of England with the Deprived Queen, and the Unfortunate Prince her Son. In this voluntary Exile from his Native Country he continued several Years, with so little Sense of his Duty to Edward, though now King *de Facto*, that he not only scorn'd to make any Application to him for his Pardon and Favour, but by Seditious Writings against his Title, he made it his Business to animate those, that were disaffected to him. Afterwards indeed he was contented to make his Submission; and his humble Petition is to be met with in the (t) Records of Parliament; but he could never be brought to this Compliance, till Henry VI. and his Son were both dead; and consequently the House of Lancaster entirely extinguished.

(t) Rot. Parl.  
13 Edw. 4.

WHAT now can be pleaded in Defence of this great Man? A Person so eminently skill'd in the Laws of his Country, could not certainly be ignorant of the English Constitution. If, as the Doctor affirms, he was bound by it to pay his Allegiance to the King *de Facto*; surely King Edward was the only Person, that could lay Claim to it on that Account; for he alone was in Possession. Shall we say then, that he was guilty of Rebellion,



lion, in Opposing his Lawful Prince, and not making an early Submission to him? I am afraid the Doctor will not readily approve of this Sentence; because I find him (u) citing him with great Reverence, as an Author of Consequence to his Cause; and yet I know not how we shall be able to acquit him, when we have thorowly consider'd all the particular Circumstances of his Behaviour; and our whole Charge against him is fully laid before the Reader. In the mean time, I will be bold to say, *Allegiance* he did indispensably owe to one King or other, either to *Edward* in Possession, or to *Henry* that was out of Possession; for no Natural-born *Englishman* can put himself out of the Condition of a Subject; or dissolve those Obligations of Duty and Obedience, which commence together with his Life: If it were so, Subjects might quit their Country, and transferr their *Allegiance* to what Prince they pleased, according to the Exigencies of Times, and their particular Humours and Inclinations; but the Laws of *England* will allow of no such Liberty; and therefore when Dr. (x) Story pleaded (upon an Indictment of High Treason in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign) that the Judges had no Power over him; for that he was a sworn Subject to the King of Spain; he was condemn'd according to the ordinary Form of *Nihil dicit*; because no Man can shake off his Country, wherein he was born; nor abjure his Native Soil or Prince at Pleasure; and so he suffer'd as a Traitor. It is not therefore to be doubted of, but Sir *John Fortescue* was sensible, he was still under the Obligations of an *English* Subject; and since it is certain, he followed the Fortune of *Henry VI*, and adhered to his Interest; it is to be presumed, he believed, that he was the only Rightful and Lawful King, though forced from his Throne; and not *Edward*, who was in full Possession of it.

(u) Dr. Higden's View of the English Const. p. 98.

(x) Camden's Annals of Queen Elizabeth, B. 2. An. 1571.

WE have the same Account in our Histories given us of Dr. *Morton*; He was a Man (says (y) an eminent Author) of great natural Wit, very well learned, and honourable in Behaviour. He had been fast upon the Part of King *Henry VI*, while that Part was in Wealth; and nathlesse left it not, nor forsook it in Woe; but fled the Realm with the Queen and the Prince, while King *Edward* had the King in Prison; and never return'd home, but to the Field; which

(y) Sir Thomas Moore's Life of Richard 3.



being irrecoverably lost, King Edward did not only (z) offer him his Pardon, but invited and wooed him unto his Service, &c.

WHAT Apology now can be made for these Gentlemen? Their Friends, it is true, think it an honourable Part in them, to preserve their Fidelity to their Prince and Benefactor, amidst his Misfortunes; but what then will become of our *Constitution*? That, says the Doctor, cancels all Obligations to Gratitude; requires them to desert a sinking and hopeless Cause, and demands their Allegiance for his greatest Enemy, who, in their Opinion, fills his Throne by Violence and Injustice. Thus we see, two of the most considerable Friends to Henry VI, whose best Title has been hitherto supposed to be his *Possession of the Crown*, persever'd in their Loyalty to him for near ten Years, though he was a Prisoner most of that Time, without the least Hopes of ever mending his Condition. Is this a Sign, that the Doctor's Principles were understood in those Days, when of all others, he would persuade us they most flourished? But Sir John Fortescue has yet more to answer for; he did not only withdraw from his Country, and refuse to submit to the Possessor of it; but (a) accepted of the Title of *Chancellor of England*, though granted him by a *Deposed King*; and which is still worse, by his Writings he openly asserted the Right of Henry VI, and the Unlawfulness of obeying Edward IV. We have still extant, in the (b) *Cotton Library*, his *Defence of the House of Lancaster against that of York*, in which he labours to prove, by sundry Arguments, that the sole Right to the Crown of England, as well by Lineal Descent, as by the Resignations of the House of York, was then entirely in King Henry: He pretended that (c) *Philippa* (from whom the Families of

(z). Dr. Morton had been attainted in the Beginning of King Edward's Reign; but did not petition for his Pardon till the 12th. Vide Rot. Parl. 1 Edw. 4. & 12 Edw. 4. f. 27.

(a) Mr. Selden's Preface to Sir John Fortescue, de laudibus Legum Angliæ. Dr. Higden's View of the Constitution, p. 98.

(b) Bibl. Cotton. Otho. B. 1.

(c) The Learned Bishop Stillingfleet, in his Unreasonableness of a New Se-

paration on account of the Oaths, p. 21, 22, 26.) having seen this Piece of Sir John Fortescue's in Defence of the House of Lancaster, has been pleased to give it so much Credit, as to believe what he affirms concerning Philippa's Illegitimacy. But the same Author having confuted that Story, at large, afterwards, in his Defence of the House of York, (which I am well assured his Lordship had also in his Hands) I wish he had thought fit to have acquainted the World with his Mistake.



*Mortimer* and *York* derived their Claim to the Crown) was not owned by the Duke of *Clarence* for his Daughter; that by the Law of *England* the Crown cannot descend to a (d) Woman; and lastly, he bestows no better Appellation upon King *Edward*, than that of *Usurper*; and expressly declares, he held the Crown no otherwise, than by Violence and Injustice. Can better Arguments be desired than these, that Sir *John Fortescue* did not approve of the Doctor's Notion? For would any Man take the Pains to prove, that a Prince out of the Throne is his only Lawful Sovereign, who yet is persuaded, that Allegiance is wholly due to a King *de Facto*? Besides, his Book in Praise of the Laws of *England*, was drawn up in the Time of his Exile, entirely for the Use and Service of the young Prince, eldest and only Son to *Henry VI.*, that he might be timely instructed in the Laws of his Country, of which he looked upon him as the only Rightful Inheritor, after his Father's Decease. For this Reason we find him addressing himself frequently to that young Prince in the most respectful Language, as to the Heir Apparent of the Crown; You, says he, most (e) renowned, (f) divine Prince, (g) who in time are to govern the Kingdom of *England*. . . . (h) I conjure you again and again, that you learn the Laws of your Father's Kingdom, to whom you are to succeed; with several other Passages to this Purpose. Now it is impossible to conceive, that the Author of these Expressions could intend them for any other Purpose, than as Compliments to a Prince entitled to the Inheritance of the Crown by the Laws of *England*: For upon what other Account could he tell him, he should one Day govern *England*, and succeed his

(d) For which, among others, he gives this extraordinary Reason, viz. because a Queen is not qualified by the Form of Anointing her, used at her Coronation, to cure the Disease called the King's Evil. His Argument, being remarkable upon this Occasion, it may be some Entertainment to the Reader's Curiosity to have a View of it. Item Regibus Angliæ Regali ipso officio plura incumbunt, quæ naturæ muliebri adversantur. ----- Reges Angliæ in ipsa Unctione suâ talem celsitudinis gratiam infusam recipiunt, quod per tactum manuum suarum unctarum Infectos morbo quodam, qui vulgò Regius morbus appellatur, mundant & curant, qui alias dicuntur incurabiles. Item aurum &

argentum Sacris unctis manibus Regum Angliæ in die Paschæ Divinorum Tempore. (quemadmodum Reges Angliæ annuatim facere solent) tactum devotè & oblatum, Spasmodicos & Caducos curant; quemadmodum per annulos ex dicto auro seu argento factos, & digitis hujusmodi morbidorum impositos, multis in mundi partibus crebro usu expertum est. Quæ gratia Reginis non confertur, cum ipsæ in manibus non ungantur, &c.

(e) Fortescue de Laud. Leg. Aug. c. 5.

(f) Ibid. c. 21.

(g) Ibid. c. 4.

(h) Ibid. c. 5.



*Father in his Kingdom?* Unless we are to suppose, Sir John spoke all this Prophetically, as an Event which should certainly come to pass, without any Regard to his present Right. I conclude therefore, that nothing can be more evident, than the Contrariety between this Gentleman's Notions of our *Constitution*, and the Doctor's. Sir John Fortescue thinks it his Duty to adhere to a Deposed King against the Possessor of his Throne: He asserts his Right in the Field with his Sword; in his Retirement, with his Pen; and interprets the Laws of his Country (in which his Learning has been always highly esteem'd) for a *King de Jure against a King de Facto*. To all this let me add, That when he made his Peace with King Edward, he retracted all that he had written against his Title; and asserted his Right with the same Zeal and Vehemency, that he had, before, King Henry VI.'s; for which he is highly commended by (i) my Lord Chief Justice Coke, as an Instance of his great Sincerity and Love for Truth. Now a properer Occasion than this could not be offer'd him, of acknowledging his former Error in paying Allegiance to a *King out of Possession*; and at the same time, he could not in Justice decline the Opportunity of vindicating the Authority of *Kings de Facto*, were there any Foundation in Law for such an Assertion, or had he been persuaded of the Reasonableness of it. But to our great Surprise, we find nothing in his Retraction to this Purpose; it is still extant, and may be perused, by those that are curious, in the (k) *Cotton Library*; but whoever gives himself the Trouble, will be sensible, that the whole Design of that Book is to prove the Right of Edward IV, from his Lineal Descent from the Duke of Clarence, and Nearness of Blood to Richard II, without any regard to his Possession.

(i) Preface to the 10th Volume of his Reports.

(k) Bibl. Cotton. Otho. B. 1. This Retraction of Sir John Fortescue is mentioned in the Records. Rot. Parl. 13 Edw. 4.

THERE is one Thing more, that must not be forgotten in this Place, though I had before Occasion to take Notice of it; and that is the remarkable Opinion of the Judges, together with Sir Jeffry Palmer, Sir Heneage Finch, Sir Edward Turner, and Mr. Wadham Wyndham, upon the Tryal of the Regicides. It was resolved by them, that the Indictment for the King's Murder should conclude, *Contra pacem nuper Domini Regis; Coron. & Dignitat. suas, necnon contra pacem Domini Regis nunc, Coron. & Dignitat. suas.* And they likewise agreed, that though King



Charles II. was *de Facto* kept out of the Exercise of the Kingly Office by Traitors and Rebels, yet he was King both *de Facto* and *de Jure*. This Account is given by Sir John Kelyng in his Reports [p. 11, 15.] publish'd with the Allowance and Approbation of my Lord Chief Justice Holt, Mr. Justice Powell, Sir Littleton Powys, and Sir Henry Gould. Here I think we have a different Notion of a King *de Facto*, from what the Doctor would teach us; and it is evident from it, that neither the Title of King, nor the Allegiance of Subjects, is upon any Account due to an Usurper.

Thus I have presented to the Reader's View some Passages taken from our Laws, and certain Testimonies also of ancient Lawyers, which clearly prove against Dr. Higden, that Kings *de Facto* were never consider'd in our Constitution, as Just and Legal Proprietors of the Kingdoms they possessed.

THE Doctor having now executed his Original Design, had nothing else to do, but to take his Repose, and reflect with Pleasure upon his Performance: But such is his Goodness, tho' he had entirely satisfy'd himself, and needed no Supply of Reasons to quiet his own Conscience, he was however willing to add some fresh Observations for the sake of his Readers. Upon so good an Account he will now undertake to prove, that the Holy Scriptures speak conformably to the Laws of our Country, and highly approve of his *English Constitution*. Now, tho' I cannot absolutely concur with him in this Assertion; yet so far I am ready to agree, that his Doctrine is most certainly to be found in Scripture, and did eminent Service in two considerable Instances; for this was Shimei's (l) Plea, when he cursed David; *The Lord hath* (l) 2 Sam. xvi. 8. *deliver'd the Kingdom into the Hand of Absalom thy Son; that is, Absalom is now in full Possession of thy Throne, and consequently GOD has rejected and depos'd thee.* Here we have a clear Proof of the ancient Authority of the Doctor's Principle, which his Adversaries will never pretend to wrest from him. The other is that of (m) Hushai, who being reproach'd by Absalom for leaving (m) Ibid. ver. 18. David his Friend, justifies his Desertion by the same Reason; *Nay but whom the Lord, and this People, and all the Men of Israel choose, His will I be, and with Him will I abide.* By this honest Insinuation Hushai was immediately admit-



ted into *Absalom's* Council; that deluded Prince could not suspect the Fidelity of a Man, who came into his Interest upon so pious and religious a Motive; and the Doctor knows the Event.

BUT the Doctor will not allow, that *Hushai* err'd in his Principle; for he is confident, that God has always requir'd Obedience, as an indispensable Duty, to those who were in Power; and that the Scriptures furnish us with many Instances to that purpose. And,

(n) *View,*  
p. 101.

First, He tells (n) us, *That the Jews lived in Subjection to the Midianites, the Moabites, and other neighbouring Nations, when they were subdued by them.* Now what real Advantage the Doctor can derive from hence, is a Question: Can any one doubt, but Submission may be lawful even to unjust Conquerors, when once they have acquir'd a full Power and Dominion over a People, and when Resistance is utterly vain and impracticable? But Submission is one thing, and a Recognition of their Right another: And the latter may be often unlawful, when the first is manifestly lawful. Thus the *Cavaliers* submitted to *Oliver Cromwell*; they pay'd Taxes to him; and endured his Tyranny and Oppressions; because they saw no other Remedy: But surely they did not acknowledge the Lawfulness of his Government, nor own he had a Title to their Allegiance. For the same Reason, why might not the *Jews* live in Subjection to the *Midianites* and *Moabites*? Were they not subdued by them? Is not this confess'd by the Doctor? Was it then necessary they should die, rather than part with their Liberty? Or will he at last be so gracious, as to allow Captives to compound for their Lives, by entring into a State of Servitude?

Secondly, Admitting the *Midianites* and *Moabites* were unjust Aggressors, and reduc'd the *Jews* under their Obedience by a causeless War, (which the Doctor will not be able to prove) it might however be lawful for the *Jews*, not only to live in Subjection, but also to pay an entire Obedience to them, as their Rightful Governors: For possibly they were at their own Disposol, and might give up their Rights and Liberties, as they saw occasion; and then it was reasonable, they should do so in those Extremities, when the Advantage would be very considerable to themselves, and no Injury thereby done to

ano-



another. Or else it may be suppos'd, that their Prince or Ruler being in the same ill Circumstances with themselves, joins with them in this Surrender and Dedition; and then the Subjects are sufficiently justify'd by the Consent of their Sovereign. But had the Matter been otherwise; had the conquer'd King of the *Jews* refus'd to give up his Right, and G O D's Authority no way expressly interpos'd in the Case; would it then have been lawful for the *Jews* to have made a Compliment of their Allegiance to the *Midianites* and *Moabites* against the Will of their Prince? This is the Question, to which the Doctor's Adversaries desire Satisfaction; but this, it is to be fear'd, they will never obtain. For let the Doctor state the Fact, as he pleases; let it be granted, that the *Jews* did actually transferr their Obedience to those Nations, without the Leave of their Rightful Sovereign; how does it appear, that this was an honest and lawful Action? Does the Scripture expressly assure us, it was so? No, that is not pretended: How can we know it then? Why, the Doctor tells (o) us, that nothing appears in *Scripture* to the contrary: That is, whenever an Action is not condemn'd by the Holy Scriptures, we are at liberty to think it Legal and Imitable. Thus it is allowable to put a Trick upon a Father, and defraud a Brother, as *Jacob* did to *Isaac* and *Esau*; and thus we may tell a Lye upon a Motive of Compassion, as the *Egyptian Midwives* did to *Pharaoh*; because the Scriptures do not pass any Censures upon those Facts: And undoubtedly, for the same good Reasons the Doctor's Readers may honestly suffer themselves to be impos'd on by him; for surely it cannot be a Sin to be cheated, if it be none to cheat.

(o) *Vicr*,  
p. 101.

W H A T has been said in Defence of the *Jews*, for their peaceable Behaviour under the *Moabites* and *Midianites*, will serve as well to justify their Obedience to the *Egyptians*, and other Conquerors, without the Assistance of the Doctor's Principle. But in the particular Case of their Subjection to the Kings of *Babylon*, we have something farther to urge in their behalf; and that is, the express Command of Almighty G O D, by Virtue of which they were oblig'd (p) to bring their Necks under the Yoke of those Princes, and serve them and their People: For unless we will dispute G O D's Supreme Dominion and Authority

(p) *Jerem.*  
xxvii. 12.



Authority over the World, we must allow his Nomination alone to be sufficient to convey a Right to Princes; and render their Acquisitions lawful. Now we must do the Doctor the Justice to own, he does not call in question God's Prerogative to dispose of Kingdoms in this manner; but he seems to deny, that the *Jews* could be influenced by that Consideration, under the *Babylonish* Captivity. For,

1. HE says the *Jews* had submitted to the King of *Babylon* before GOD had commanded them to do so; which was not till *Zedekiah's* Reign. But surely the Prophet *Jeremy* had given the *Jews* publick Notice, in the fourth Year of *Jehoiakim*, (q) that GOD would deliver them up to the King of *Babylon*, and had condemn'd them to a State of Servitude for Seventy Years. Now this Declaration alone, though it had never been seconded by any express Injunction of Obedience, was a sufficient Admonition to the *Jews*, that it would be best for them to live peaceably and quietly under their new Masters; for to resist, upon a full Assurance of doing it without Success, (which GOD had before-hand warn'd them, would be their Fate) must have been the Height of Folly and Madness. Again, the Commission, by Virtue of which the Prophet spake to *Zedekiah*, to bring his Neck under the Yoke of the King of *Babylon*, was given (r) in the Beginning of the Reign of *Jehoiakim*; and was then openly notify'd by the Bonds and Yokes, which *Jeremiah* was commanded to put upon his Neck. So that the *Jews* had early Notice, before *Zedekiah's* Reign, that it was GOD's Pleasure, they should prepare their Necks for the *Babylonish* Yoke; and arm themselves with Patience for a long Captivity.

BUT after all, though the *Jews* had indeed made an outward Profession of Obedience to *Nebuchadnezzar*; tho' two of their Kings, with all their principal Subjects, were his Prisoners in *Babylon*, and found it necessary to behave themselves there with all external Signs of Humility and Observance; though *Zedekiah* (s) govern'd *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, as an *Assyrian* Province, only by Virtue of a Commission from the Conqueror, to whom he had sworn Allegiance; yet the great Searcher of Hearts knew, that this their pretended Submission was altogether feign'd and hypocritical; and that they only wait-

(q) Jerem.  
xxv. 9, 11.

(r) Jerem.  
xxvii. 1, &c.

(s) 2 Chron.  
xxxvi.



ed for an Opportunity to shake off the Yoke, which they were resolv'd never to bear, notwithstanding their publick Engagements to the contrary. This was the Reason of the many Messages, which G O D sent by *Jeremiah* to the *Jews*, requiring them to serve the King of *Babylon*, and threatening to abandon them entirely to the Mercy of their Enemies, if they departed from their Obedience to him. From whence it is evident, that how dutiful soever their Language and Addresses might be, nothing but Sedition and a Revolt was in their Hearts, which would unavoidably end in their utter Destruction. So that the utmost Use that can possibly be made of this Case of the *Jews*, is no more than this; That whenever a Conquer'd People are in the same Circumstances, in which the *Jews* then were; when *their Kings are bound in Chains, and their Nobles with Fetters of Iron*; and the remaining Heirs of the Kingdom have openly renounced all Pretences to it, by the most Sacred Obligations: In a word, when all Efforts for their Liberty seem evidently vain and ineffectual to common Sense; and the Voice of G O D has besides declar'd, that Resistance should be their Ruin; it is then not only lawful to be quiet and peaceable, but a manifest Indication of Distraction to be otherwise. And now, if the Doctor can draw an exact Parallel to this Case, from any Revolutions within his Memory, let him make the best of it.

FROM the Old Testament we must now wait upon the Doctor to the New, to which he assures us his Doctrine is also agreeable; *as appears, says (t) he, from our Saviour's Resolution of the Case, that was put to him, whether (t) View, P. 89. it was lawful to pay Tribute to Cæsar, or not. He bid them shew him the Tribute-Money; and only asked them, whose Image and Superscription it was, (i. e. who is in Possession of the Government?) and when they answer'd him, Cæsar's; he immediately determines, Render therefore to Cæsar the Things that are Cæsar's, &c.*

N O W here, I must confess, I am extremely at a Loss; and after my best Endeavours to discover by what profound Politicks the Doctor was induc'd to think this Argument for his Service, I am forced to give over my Enquiries, without any Prospect of Satisfaction. Has the Doctor then found it out at last; and is it no longer to be doubted, but that whoever has Power enough to



coin Money, is always in full and lawful Possession, and ought to be look'd upon as God's Vicegerent? Then surely it will follow, that *Oliver Cromwell* had a Title to the Allegiance of the People of *England*; for it can never be denied, but he might have shew'd his Money to the Cavaliers, and ask'd them the same Question, which our Saviour did the Pharisees, *whose Image and Superscription is this?* And the Doctor cannot but be sensible, that he must admit of this Consequence, unless he will decline the Authority of *Grotius*, to whom he has manifestly appeal'd for the right Understanding of this Place of Scripture. For *Grotius*, in the very Place (u) cited by the Doctor, plainly affirms, that his Allegiance was due only to the *States of Holland and West-Frizeland*, and not to the *States-General*; To the former only, says he, *I am sworn, and not to the latter, to whom the Military Men alone take Oaths of Obedience*: And then he adds, as a Proof, that he own'd Subjection only to the *States of Holland and West-Frizeland*, *That if any one in our Time had shew'd our Money, and ask'd, whose is this Image? Any Man, both the Learned and the Unlearned, would readily have answer'd; The States of Holland's*. Thus at length it appears, that our late *Commonwealth*, and even *Oliver Cromwell*, was no *Usurper*. But why then is the Doctor so angry with his Adversaries, when they tell him, his Arguments are as serviceable to that *Tyrant*, as to any of his *Kings de Facto*? Is there any one of their Objections, which he resents with greater Indignation, (x) than that which reproaches him with defending the Cause of *Cromwell*? Does not he tell them over and over, that *Cromwell had not the Supreme Power, or Sovereign Authority in England, and that it could never be prov'd, from his Principles, that the Obedience of the Subjects was due to him?* How! Is it possible that the Doctor should so much forget himself? Is it not his avow'd (y) Principle, that the *Coining of Money* is a certain Mark of Sovereignty? That whoever has that Power, ought to be obey'd by our Saviour's own express Precept and Direction? And is not this a good Proof of *Cromwell's* divine Authority? But the Doctor tells us, our *Constitution* is a sacred Thing too; and by that he is very (z) confident, *Cromwell could not be authorized to exercise any manner of Power; for he had not the Regal Title, to which alone by our Laws the Royal Office is annex'd; and besides he had never*

(u) *Votum*  
pro pace.

(x) See his  
*Defence*, p.  
103, to 107.

(y) *View*,  
p. 89.

(z) *Defence*,  
p. 106.

been



been recognized by the States of the Realm. Thus it is, when we have to do with acute and judicious Writers; but then it is evident, that our *Constitution* teaches us one Doctrine, and the Holy Scriptures another: And how can it then be true, that they entirely agree in obliging Subjects to obey those, who are in Possession of the Government, which the Doctor expressly (a) affirms? In a word, if the Power of Coining Money be a sufficient Token of the Divine Commission of the Person possess'd of it, it will not only follow, that *Oliver Cromwell* was a Lawful Governor; but that we had some Hundreds such at once in *England* in King *Stephen's* Time: For (b) a good Author tells us, *That in those Days many Castles were erected in every County by the great Men; and that there were then in England as many Kings, or rather Tyrants, as there were Lords of Castles, every one of them coining their own Money, and administering Justice to their respective Subjects.*

UPON this Occasion I would intreat the Reader's Pardon, if I detain him a little upon the Subject of *Cromwell's* Authority, which though it has been sufficiently consider'd (c) already, yet it may be worth while to add some other Particulars, to convince the Doctor, that as he has managed the Matter, it will be hardly possible for him to prove *Cromwell* to have been an Usurper. His first Argument is this:

1. *Cromwell* had not (says (d) the Doctor) the Supreme Power, or Sovereign Authority of *England*. This is very strange! He exercised an absolute Sovereignty; He was courted by all Foreign Nations with Fear and Trembling; and the People of *England*, without Distinction, found it necessary to endure his Tyranny with Patience and Resignation. *The late Transactions of these twelve Years past* (says a (e) Lawyer of great Authority) *had involv'd so many Persons, that we could scarce find a Man, but he had need of the King's Mercy.* And another very (f) eminent Writer has assur'd us, *That the whole Estates of the Crown,*

(a) *View*, p. 89.

(b) *Castella per singulas Provincias studio partium crebra surrexerant, erantque in Angliâ quodammodo tot Reges, vel potius Tyranni, quot Domini Castellorum; habentes singuli percussuram proprii numismatis, & potestatem subditis, regio more, dicendi Juris.* Will. Neubrigenf. *Rer. Angl.* l. 1. c. 22.

(c) *Introduction*, p. 3, & seq.

(d) *Defence*, p. 106.

(e) *The Solicitor-General, afterwards Lord Chancellor Finch, at the Tryal of Cook the Regicide.*

(f) *The late Bishop of Rochester's Observations on Sorbiere's Voyage.*



the Clergy, and most of the Nobility and Gentry, and indeed well nigh the whole Nation, were then at the Usurper's Disposal. And (which I would only whisper in the Doctor's Ear, without designing it for the Information of the Reader) there was not one *Non-furor* in all the Time of his Government.

(g) *Defence,*  
ubi supra.

2. WE are told, (g) that *Cromwell* could not be a Lawful Governor, because he had not the Regal Title, to which alone (as the Doctor affirms) by our Laws the Regal Office is annex'd. But this is likewise a vain Surmise; for our Histories furnish us with Instances, that the Regal Office has been sometimes lawfully exercised, without the Regal

(h) P. 51.

Title; which I before (h) observ'd to be the Case of *Maud* the Empress; and on the other hand, we are certain, our Laws have conferred the Title of King, without annexing to it Sovereign Power. Thus the eldest Son of *Henry II.* was crowned and anointed King of Eng-

(i) *These*  
*are Mr. Sel-*  
*den's own*  
*Words in his*  
*Mare Clau-*  
*sum, B. 2.*  
c. 19.

land in his Father's Life-time; and yet he remained in the Condition of a Subject. (i) King *Richard II.* when he had determin'd that *Robert Earl of Oxford* (who also was *Marquis of Dublin*, and *Duke of Ireland*) should be created King of Ireland; questionless did not doubt, but that he himself in the mean while possess'd that Island by as good a Title, although he was only styl'd Lord thereof. And when *Henry VI.* had created *Henry Beauchamp*, *Duke of Warwick*,

(k) *Mr. Sel-*  
*den, Ibid.*

King of the Isles of *Wight*, *Guernsey*, and *Jersey*, (k) it was never disputed, but he still retain'd the supreme Dominion over those Islands.

(l) *Defence,*  
*Ibid.*

3. THE Doctor adds, (l) that *Cromwell* had never been recogniz'd by the States of the Realm. A Confession, that if this had happen'd, he would then have been a Lawful Monarch. And what is this, but attributing to the Three Estates a Power of Deposing Kings, as hath been abundantly (m) prov'd already? And after this plain Acknowledgment, the Doctor may inveigh against Republican Principles, as long as he pleases; but he has certainly so far subjected the Rights of Kings to the Will and Disposal of the People, that when once they have pronounc'd their Sentence, that they will not have this Man reign over them, there is then an End of all his Pretensions, and in an Instant he becomes a Private Person.

(m) *Intro-*  
*duction, ibid.*

LET not the Doctor be offended, that I apply the Name of People to the States of the Realm; for in their  
highest



highest Capacities they are but the *People's* Representatives ; and when all is said, the greatest Peers are but the greatest Subjects : And if they are no more than so, I wish the Doctor would shew us, where he finds it in our *Constitution*, that the Subjects can transferr their *Allegiance* whensoever they think it proper. To bring this Matter to a Point, I should be glad to learn from the Doctor, whether the Parliament which declared *Richard II.*'s Throne vacant, and placed *Henry IV.* in it, were Subjects, or not. The Doctor cannot but be sensible, that the Power he ascribes to the *States of the Realm*, will depend upon the Resolution of this Question ; and therefore it is to be hoped, he will take it into Consideration.

Now though, the Doctor will find this Opinion of his very artfully supported in the learned Writings of *Buchanan*, *Milton*, and *Johnson* ; yet I must not conceal from him, (if it be not a Presumption in me, to think this is a Secret to him) that the House of Commons of 1642, may justly claim the Honour of first setting this Doctrine in its true Light, and (which is a Circumstance much to be regarded by the Doctor, and will without doubt exceedingly endear that Statute to him) they endeavour to prove it from the eleventh of *Henry VII.* I shall set down the whole Matter, as I find it in *Rushworth's* (n) Collections, and leave it to the Doctor, to form his Speculations upon it.

(n) Part 3.  
Vol. 1.

KING *Charles I.* (o) recommends to his loving Subjects (in order to inform themselves, what their Duty was to him in those difficult Times) the careful Perusal of the Statute of the eleventh of *Henry VII.*, which required their Attendance on the King in his Wars, as an indispensable Part of their Allegiance ; and at the same time so order'd it, that the said Statute was reprinted by itself, and dispersed about the Kingdom. The House of Commons finding themselves concerned to prevent the dangerous Operation of that *Act of Parliament*, soon after resolv'd upon a Remonstrance for their Justification, and (p) they likewise particularly advise their Friends, to take great Notice of that Statute, as a proper Rule for their Conduct and Behaviour, in the following Words :

(o) Answer  
to the Decla-  
ration of the  
Parliament,  
May 4. 1642.

(p) May 26.  
1642.



THAT all Men may the better know their Duty in Matters of that Nature, and upon how sure a Ground they go, that follow the Judgment of Parliament for their Guide; we wish them judiciously to consider the true Meaning and Ground of that Statute, made in the eleventh Year of Henry VII, cap. 1. which is printed at large at the End of his Majesty's Message of the fourth of May. This Statute provides, that none that shall attend on the King, and do him true Service, shall be attainted or forfeit any thing. What was the Scope of this Statute? To provide that Men should not suffer as Traitors for serving the King in his Wars, according to the Duty of their Allegiance? If this had been all, it had been a very needless and ridiculous Statute. Was it then intended (as they may seem to take the Meaning of it to be, that caused it to be printed after his Majesty's Message) that they should be free from all Crime and Penalty, that should follow the King, and serve him in War, in any Case whatsoever, whether it were for, or against the Kingdome, and the Laws thereof? That cannot be; for that cannot stand with the Duty of their Allegiance, which in the Beginning of this Statute is express'd to be, to serve the King for the Time being in his Wars, for the Defence of him and the Land; and therefore if it be against the Land, (as it cannot be understood to be otherwise, if it be against the Parliament, the Representative Body of the Kingdom) it is a Declining from the Duty of Allegiance, (which this Statute supposeth may be done) tho' Men should follow the King's Person in the War: Otherwise there had been no need of such a Proviso in the End of this Statute, that none should take Benefit thereby, that should decline from their Allegiance. That therefore which is the principal Verb in this Statute, is the serving the King for the Time being, which cannot be meant of a Perkin Warbeck, or any that should call himself King, but such a one as, whatever his Title might prove, either in himself or his Ancestors, should be received and acknowledged for such by the Kingdom, the Consent whereof cannot be discerned but by Parliament, the Act whereof is the Act of the whole Kingdom, by the Personal Suffrage of the Peers, and the Delegate Consent of all the Commons of England.

And Henry VII, a wise King, considering that what was the Case of Richard III. his Predecessor, might, by Chance of Battle, be his own; that he might at once by such a Statute as this, satisfy such as had serv'd his Predecessor in his Wars, and also secure those, that should serve him, who might otherwise fear  
to



to serve him in the War, lest by Chance of Battle that might happen to him also, (if a Duke of York had set up a Title against him) which had happen'd to his Predecessor; he procured this Statute to be made, that no Man should be accounted a Traitor for serving the King in his Wars for the Time being; that is, which was for the present allowed and received by the Parliament in behalf of the Kingdom. And, as it is truly suggested in the Preamble of the Statute, it is not agreeable to Reason, or Conscience, that it should be otherwise; seeing Men should be put upon an Impossibility of knowing their Duty, if the Judgment of the Highest Court should not be a Rule and Guide to them. And if the Judgment thereof should be followed, where the Question is, Who is King? much more, What is the best Service of the King and Kingdom? And therefore those that shall guide themselves by the Judgment of Parliament, ought, whatever happens, to be secure and free from all Account and Penalties, upon the Grounds and Equity of this very Statute.

AND to the same purpose they argue against the King, and defend this their Exposition of the 11th of Henry VII. in a following Remonstrance, Nov. 2. 1642. in these Words.

(q) GOD be thanked, the Case is not now, as it was at the Time when this Statute, viz. 11th of Henry VII. was made, to secure his Subjects from that continual Uncertainty and Danger they were exposed unto, in respect of the different Titles of York and Lancaster; the one prevailing one while, and the other another time: And therefore by this Statute it was provided, that whosoever should serve the King for the Time being (whatever his Title may prove) should be free from all Crime and Penalty. So that whomsoever the Parliament had at that Time received in the behalf of the Kingdom, he must undoubtedly have been accounted the King for the Time being; and consequently the People secured in following him, tho' another and haply a better Title had been set up against him, (as if there had been a True Duke of York living, a better might have been set up against him, Henry VII. than his own:) We say then, as we said before, if it be against Reason and Conscience, that Men should suffer, that guide themselves by the Judgment of the highest Court, which is also the Representative Body of the whole Kingdom; and if in this Statute the Parliament is made Judge in the Question, Who is King? much more are they to be Judge in the Question, What is the best Service of the King and Kingdom?

(q) Rushworth's Col-  
lect. Ibid.



*dom ? And they ought to be free from all Crime and Punishment, that follow the Judgment thereof, upon the very Grounds and Reasons of this Statute, which we do agree, his Majesty's good Subjects may read with Comfort ; because it lays down a Ground, which delivers them from Uncertainty in their Obedience, in the difficultest and highest Cases whatsoever.*

FROM these Extracts the following Remarks will be obvious to the Reader. 1. That the present Construction of the 11th of *Henry VII.* so often appealed to, and so much insisted upon by many eminent Writers soon after the Revolution, and now again lately by *Dr. Higdén*, was of old urged, maintained, and published as Law, by that Parliament, which took up Arms against the King. I will not say, they were the first, that ever expounded this Statute in favour of Kings *de Facto* ; for I think my Lord *Bacon* had before deliver'd his Opinion to that purpose : But I may boldly affirm, that none had ever, till that time, taken so much Pains to clear and establish the true Sense of it, by such solid and weighty Arguments, as those brave Assertors of the Rights and Liberties of the People of *England*. 2. They assure us, it was Part of our Constitution, that *whoever should be set up or owned by the Parliament as King, tho' another, and haply a better Title, should be advanced against him ; (which might have been the Case of Henry VII. had the true Duke of York been then living ;) he ought undoubtedly to be accounted the King for the Time being within that Statute.* And the Reason they assign for these Doctrines, is worth observing. *It is not agreeable (say they) to Reason or Conscience, that it should be otherwise ; seeing Men should be put upon an Impossibility of knowing their Duty, if the Judgment of the Highest Court should not be a Rule and Guide to them, &c.* Thus then it is evident, that all those momentous *Points of Law*, which the Doctor has labour'd so much to defend in his *View*, were long since advanced, and asserted to his Hand, by that Learned Assembly of *True Patriots*, who began the Civil War against King *Charles I.* The true Meaning of *Henry VII.*'s Statute could not escape the Penetration of that Judicious *Body* ; they took care then to publish their Sense of it ; and I have now, with great Fidelity, transcribed it for the common Benefit. Here we see the Doctor's Principle publicly own'd and embrac'd by the *Representatives* of the Nation ; Allegiance is declared to be due to Kings *de Facto*, by Virtue of the



11th of Henry VII, and not to all Kings *de Facto* neither, but only to such as shall be *receiv'd and acknowledged* by Parliament, or, as the Doctor chooses to express himself, *shall be recognized by the States of the Realm.*

It must be confess'd however, as well supported as this Doctrine is by the abovemention'd Authority, it is liable to some Objections, which it may become the Doctor to remove; and therefore I shall beg Leave to propose them to him.

1. It may be said, that when King Charles I. drew up his Answer to that Remonstrance of the *House of Commons*, in which they first vented their Exposition of the 11th of Henry VII; He takes Notice of it, as New and Singular, and never before heard of. *They proceed* (says the King) *in the Spirit of Declaring, to certify our Subjects in the Mistakings, which near 150 Years have been receiv'd, concerning the Statute of the 11th of Hen. VII. cap. 1. (a Statute our good Subjects will read with Comfort) and tell them, that the Service of the King for the Time being, cannot be meant of Perkin Warbeck, or of any that shall call himself King, but of such a one as is allowed and received by the Parliament in behalf of the Kingdom, &c.*

HERE it is plain the Good King (who did nothing of this Nature without the Advice and Consent of his Council) wonders at the Construction given by the *Commons*, of this Statute; he recites it only with an Intention to expose it; and thinks it a sufficient Argument against it, that a different Opinion had universally prevail'd, ever since the first making of that Statute. Now I am apt to think, the Doctor will be a little surprized (I speak this still upon a Supposition, that these Passages had escaped his Observation) to find a Judicious Prince (for whose Memory, I am very sure, he has a high and just Value) so ignorant of our *Constitution*, as to treat with Contempt that very Opinion, which the Doctor has taken so much Pains to prove, will do the greatest Honour to our Country, and is the noblest Indication of its Wisdom. But this perhaps is an idle Imagination; and what some weak People may fancy to be Difficulties, will not appear so to the Doctor. I proceed however to another Objection.

2. WE have likewise the Testimony of a very eminent Lawyer against the Doctrine of the *House of Com-*



(r) *After-  
wards Lord  
Chancellor  
Finch.*

*mons*; and this he deliver'd in a Court of Justice at the Tryal of one of the *Regicides*. It is well known to those who have perused the Judicial Proceedings against those Criminals, that several of them pleaded the 11th of Henry VII. in their Defence; and particularly Colonel *Martin* had so good an Opinion of the Authority of that Statute, as expounded by the foremention'd Parliament, that he plainly intimated, *a Parliamentary Title was the best King Charles II. had*. This Piece of Confidence was so highly resented by the (r) *Solicitor General* that then was, that he made the following Answer. *My Lord, this Gentleman, the Prisoner at the Bar, hath entred into a Discourse, that I am afraid he must have an Answer for in Parliament. He hath owned the King; but thinks his best Title is the Acknowledgment of the People, and he that hath that, let him be who he will, hath the best Title*. Now this is *Point-blank* against the Doctor's Assertion; for nothing is more evident, than that this *Great Man* was extremely offended with the Position, that a *Parliamentary Title* was the best a King of *England* could have. But certainly this is what the Doctor maintains; for he affirms, that the *Recognition of the States of the Realm* is sufficient to make a Lawful King, and then it must be sufficient to supersede a Title by Birth, and consequently is the *best Title*.

I AM sensible, this has been a very long Digression, for which I shall need my Reader's Pardon; and this I doubt not he will grant the more readily, if he considers it consists of some Particulars too material to be wholly omitted, and will allow me to tell him, I am not now at Leisure to insert them in their proper Place.

I RETURN now to the Doctor's Argument from our Saviour's Answer to the *Pharisees*, upon Sight of the *Tribute Money*. I have shew'd him the ill Consequence of *Grotius's* Exposition of that Place; and would now recommend some farther Difficulties to his Consideration, which may be objected against that *Learned Man's* Opinion. The Truth is, when a Text is capable of various Interpretations, and able Commentators are divided in their Sentiments about its true Meaning, it is a little too arrogant in the most applauded Writer, to think to impose his own Conjecture uncontrollably upon his Reader, before he has satisfied him, that the Attempts of others have really fail'd of Success. Thus it is with *Grotius*; he

abounds



abounds in his own Sense, in the Explication of the Passage now before us, without pretending to confute the different Solutions, which have appear'd plausible to other Judgments; and I may appeal to Dr. *Higden* himself, the greatest of his Admirers, in the Question now under Consideration, whether that Learned Annotator has produced one Argument, by Virtue of which it is more reasonable to be of his Persuasion, than of theirs from whom he dissents. Let us examine this Matter more at large.

1. SOME have been of Opinion, that our *Saviour* did not in these Words teach, that *Tribute* was to be render'd to *Cæsar*; 'Tis only, say they, a general Precept of giving to *God* and *Cæsar* their Due, without determining particularly, what their Right was. It may, it is true, be objected, that then our *Saviour's* Answer was evasive, and not at all to the Question; but this gives them no Disturbance; for considering the insidious Intention with which the *Pharisees* put this Question, they are of Opinion, it was highly consistent with his Prudence to return such an Answer, as would rather silence them, than satisfy their Doubt; and this is said to have been Mr. *Calvin's* Notion. In Defence of which they add, (s) that if our *Saviour* had expressly enjoin'd the Payment of *Tribute* to *Cæsar*, in this Answer, which was utter'd publickly, and before a great Multitude in the Temple; his Adversaries could not have had the Impudence, a few Days after, to accuse him before *Pilate*, as one that perverted the Nation, and forbid to give *Tribute* to *Cæsar*: For tho' there was no sort of Villany, that their Malice would not have prompted them to commit, in order to destroy him; yet they must have had too much Regard to their own Interest and Safety, to charge him with what so many knew to be a Slander.

(s) See the  
Exercitation  
concerning  
Usurped  
Powers,  
printed 1650.

2. OTHERS think our *Saviour* did give a direct Answer to the *Pharisees*; but then they say, it will by no means follow, that he enjoined Obedience to all *unlawful* and *usurped* Powers; for his Command extended no farther, than to the Payment of *Tribute*; which may be due to ambitious, warlike, and dangerous Neighbours, rather as a wise Expedient to prevent a total Subjection, than as a necessary Consequence and Effect of it. In this Case it is not material, whether the Prince, that demands *Tribute*, has a Right to it, or no; because they that pay



pay it, are supposed to consider only his Power of Injuring and Oppressing them, which they are not able to oppose; and therefore may lawfully compound for their Security, by offering a Part, in order to save the Remainder. Now the *Jews*, at the Time we are speaking of, were really a Conquer'd People; their Country had been reduced into the Form of a *Roman Province* by *Augustus*, and was entirely at his Mercy; but his Indulgence to them was remarkable; he permitted them to govern themselves by their own Laws; and allow'd them Privileges seldom granted to a Vanquish'd Nation; in Return for which mighty Favours, he was contented with an Annual Tribute, which they had all imaginable Reason to submit to. They knew very well, they had formerly paid Tribute to the *Egyptians*, the *Persians*, and the *Macedonians*; and therefore had no Pretence to be scrupulous, now it was exacted from them by the *Romans*.

(t) De Jure  
Nat. sec. He-  
braeos, l. 6.  
c. 17.

3. ANOTHER Reason assign'd, why our Saviour required the Payment of Tribute to *Cæsar*, was, because he had a good Title to the Obedience of the *Jews*, by Virtue of their entire Submission, and Surrender of their Government to the *Romans*. This was the Opinion of Mr. (t) *Selden*, and Dr. *Hammond*, not to name any more. They were persuaded, that the *Jews* had unanimously put themselves under the *Roman* Protection, and consequently had bound themselves to the Payment of Tribute, and all other customary Acknowledgments, due from subordinate States and Principalities to their Sovereigns: That for this Reason our Saviour called for the *Tribute-Money*, that by the Sight of the Image and Superscription, they might be convinced, how unreasonable their Pretensions to Liberty were, after so plain and manifest a Resignation of it, as then appeared to their View. For, in the Opinion of those learned Men, this *Tribute-Money* exhibited undeniable Marks and Tokens of the *Roman* Authority over them, and therefore plainly determin'd the Question against them.

THUS we see here are Three Expositions of our Saviour's Answer, much different from that of *Grotius*; for he supposes that *Cæsar* was an *Usurper*; and that our Saviour reprehended the *Pharisees* for not submitting to him, though he was so, and no better: But of those, I have



have now recited, two of them have no Relation to the Title of the *Roman Emperor*; and the last plainly asserts it to be good and unquestionable. Now, if these Opinions are really absurd, and untenable, and by no means fit to be countenanced, in Comparison with that of *Grotius*; let them fare as they deserve; but surely we owe them that Justice, not to condemn them before Examination; which since neither *Grotius* nor *Dr. Higden* have thought fit to bestow upon them, I beg Leave to become an earnest Suiter to the Doctor, that he will retract his Censure, till they have undergone their due Tryal; and then he may proceed against them as he pleases. On the other hand, it is most certain, that *Grotius's* Opinion is liable to great Objections, which I shall now propose to the Doctor's Consideration.

I. IT is plain from our *Saviour's* Answer, that he did not desire, the *Jews* should do more for *Cæsar*, than was consistent with the common Principles of Right and Justice: He bids them *give unto Cæsar the Things that be Cæsar's*; that is, give him what is his Due, what he may lawfully claim, and what you yourselves must allow to belong to him, by your own avow'd Maxims and Rules of Equity. He did not pretend to give them any new Laws, by which they should judge of the Titles of Princes; but plainly refers them to those already in Being for their Direction; and consequently, it is not possible to explain our Saviour's Meaning according to *Grotius's* Imagination. For where shall we find in the *Old Testament* the least Instance of *God's* obliging People to be subject to Usurpers? Or how can it be proved, that the Laws of Nature have made it their Duty? It is true, great Endeavours have been used to pass this Deceit upon the World; and *Dr. Higden* has thought it worth his while, to transcribe some of the common Arguments urged for that Purpose; but the Fallacy is easily detected, and has been sufficiently made to appear, to the Satisfaction of reasonable Men. Had our *Blessed Saviour* established the Rights of Princes on any different Foundation, than what they stood upon before; his Will, in a Matter of so great Consequence, would have been clearly reveal'd, and the *Evangelical* Writings would have borne Witness to this Truth, in Terms that could not be controverted: But that Confidence has hitherto proved



vain, which has pretended to any such Discoveries ; and indeed, had the *Gospel* introduced any such Innovation as this, the Nature of *Civil Rights* must consequently have been changed ; and it would not have been true, which the (u) Doctor himself confesses, that our *Blessed LORD* made no Alteration in Matters of Government ; but left the Governments of the World as he found them.

2. THE Fact upon which *Grotius* founds his Argument, seems plainly to be mistaken by him. He would persuade us, that *Tribute* was due to *Cæsar*, because he was in Possession of *Judæa* ; and to prove his Possession, he alledges his *Coining* of Money there, as an indisputable Mark and Token of it : But he should have consider'd, that amidst these great Changes, which befell the *Jewish* Government, (x) they still retain'd the Power of *Coining* their own Money ; and never lost it till the final Destruction of their City under *Vespasian*.

NEITHER was this a Favour allowed only to the *Jews* ; for there was hardly a City of Note, in the Eastern Part of the Empire, which did not enjoy the same Privilege ; as those who are but moderately skilled in this kind of Learning, are able to bear me Witness. A little Insight into the Cabinets of the Medalists will shew, that the *Roman Emperors* were well enough contented, their conquer'd Subjects should coin their own Money at their Pleasure ; especially if they took Care to adorn it with their Images, and did not forget to compliment them, upon extraordinary Occasions, with *Inscriptions* to their Honour : So that if the Extent of the *Roman* Power and Dominion were to be inferred only from the Number of *Mints*, which were managed by their own proper Officers ; we should soon reduce it into a very narrow Compass : And our *Saviour's* Answer, instead of proving that *Tribute* was due to *Cæsar*, would serve to a quite contrary Purpose ; that is, it would plainly shew, the *Jews* were a

(u) *View*, p. 88.

(x) Marqu. Freherus de Numismate Censit, p. 16. Quod sub Græcis Regibus, nominatim autem Demetrio Syriæ Rege, Simoni Sacerdoti magno Judæorum, inter alia privilegia & immunitates, concessum legimus (1 Maccab. 15.6.) sc. facere percussuram proprii Numismatis in Regione sua ; id eis à Romanis adem-

ptum & abrogatum fuisse nusquam legimus. Et J. Seldenus de Jure Nat. & Gent. juxta Hebræos, l. 2. c. 8. p. 224. Ed. Lond. Certè jus cudendæ monetæ etiam tunc [i.e. in our Saviour's Time] Ebræis inter privilegia alia extima mansisse, non immeritò existimant viri docti, nec ante excidium sub Vespasiano sublatum.



Free People, under no Obligations of Obedience to any foreign Potentate.

IF it should be said, that the *Tribute-Money* having *Cæsar's Image* upon it, could not be struck by the *Jews*, their (y) Law absolutely forbidding them to employ themselves in any Works of that Nature: I answer; it will not from thence follow, that the *Romans* did actually coin that Money in *Judæa*, with which their Tribute was paid; for the *Jews* might furnish themselves with a sufficient Quantity of Money for that Occasion, by Exchange and Commerce, as well as if a *Mint* had been set up on purpose in *Jerusalem*, for the Coinage of *Roman Money*. Besides, every one of the *Jews* (who were in great Numbers dispersed throughout all Parts of the *Roman Empire*) being obliged by their Law to pay yearly to the *Temple* a Piece of Money; the greatest Part of this Sum was undoubtedly returned in *Roman Money*, which would sufficiently enable them to pay their Civil Tribute; and perhaps this was a great Part of the Employment of the *Money-Changers*, which our *Saviour* drove out of the *Temple*, *Matth. xxi. 12.*

3. *Grotius* was not always of this Opinion. In his Annotations, indeed, upon the *Gospels*, he seems extremely fond of it; but in his famous (z) Book *de Jure Belli & Pacis*, in that very Passage cited by the Doctor, he pretends only, that *Possession confers a Title in controverted and doubtful Cases*; and urges this Answer of our *Blessed Saviour* to prove it; a Matter, which no reasonable Man will ever contest; that Maxim in Law being universally received, that *in rebus dubiis melior est conditio possidentis*. But in his Notes on the *Old Testament* (which may justly be look'd upon as the final Resolution of that great Man in several Instances) he clearly disapproves of that Opinion, which affirms *Right* to be the inseparable Attendant on *Possession*; and asserts the contrary. Thus, upon these

(y) J. Selden. de Jur. Nat. juxta Hebræos, l. 2. c. 6. & H. Grotius, ad. 2. Præc. Decalogi.

(z) This Book was publish'd by Grotius, after his Annotations on the *Gospels*; in which it is observable, he does not only speak with more Reserve upon that Text of Giving to *Cæsar*, &c. but indeed plainly denies, that a Prince unjustly dispossessed does thereby lose his Right. Lib. 2. c. 16.

sect. 17. Sanè cum Rege initum fœdus manet, etiam si Rex idem aut Successor Regno à Subditis sit pulsus. Jus enim Regni penes ipsum manet, utcumque Possessionem amiserit; quo pertinet Lucani illud de Senatu Romano:

----- Non unquam perdidit ordo  
Mutato sua jura loco. -----



Words of the Prophet *Jeremy* [Jerem. xlix. 1.] *Concerning the Ammonites, thus saith the LORD, hath Israel no Sons? Hath he no Heirs? Why then doth their King inherit Gad, and his People dwell in his Cities?* *Grotius* remarks, that they were a clear Determination for *Hereditary Right* against *Possession*. From hence (says (a) he) we learn, that although it is said, that whoever makes himself Master of any Country by Force of Arms, is by the Law of Nations the true Lord and Proprietor of it; yet if the War be unjust, neither the Conqueror, nor those that act under him, are acquitted before GOD. What can the Doctor's Adversaries desire more, than this Concession of *Grotius*? Is it not from hence plain, that *Possession* against an Antecedent Title will not create a *Right*, which is all they contend for?

4. THIS Opinion, that wherever any Person has Power enough to coin Money, he is a Lawful Possessor; must needs have proved so fatal to the Roman Empire, that had it been the Christian Doctrine, for that Reason alone, the Professors of it would have been treated with the utmost Rigour and Severity, as Enemies to *Cæsar*, and the most dangerous Promoters of Sedition and Rebellion; for considering the Multitude of Coining Offices throughout the Imperial Dominions, it was hardly possible for any Rebel to be so unfortunate, as not to be Master of a City, which had a Mint; and then he had nothing else to do, but to stamp his Image on his Money, in order to become a Lawful Proprietor. But among the great Number of Crimes charged upon the Christians, which are carefully recorded by the Primitive Apologists, we no where find, that they were accused upon this Article: On the contrary, to the no little Confusion of those, who advance this Notion, *Tertullian* has expressly assured us, that they abhorred this Doctrine; for (c) in his Remonstrance to *Scapula* the Roman Governor, he alledges it as an Instance of the Christian Loyalty, that no Man could accuse his Brethren of being *Albiniani*, *Nigriani*, or *Cassiani*; that is, that they had been Adherents to *Clodius Albinus*,

(a) *Grotius* ad Jerem. 49. 1. Discimus hinc, quanquam vulgò dicitur, qui bello terras aliquas cepit, eorum Dominus fieri jure Gentium; id tamen, si bellum sit injustum, neque ipsum capientem, neque alios causam ab eo habentes, apud Deum absolvere.

(b) *Tertullianus* in Lib. ad *Scapulam*. Sed & circa majestatem Imperatoris infamamur; tamen nunquam *Albiniani*, nec *Nigriani*, vel *Cassiani*, inveniri potuerunt Christiani, sed iidem ipsi, qui per Genios eorum in pridie usque juraverunt, qui Christianos sæpe damnaverant, &c.



*Pescennius Niger*, or *Avidius Cassius*; the two first of these were Governors of great Provinces, had numerous Armies at their Command, and were elected *Emperors* by them; and all of them coined Money with their Images upon them, and the Inscription of *Imperatores* and *Augusti*, as is well known to those, who are any thing curious in these Studies, and may be seen in *Mediobarbus*, and other Authors, who treat upon the Subject of *Medals*. Is it not then evident, that the Christians of those Times had not learnt this Doctrine of Paying Allegiance to those, who were in Possession, and could shew their Images on their Money? Had they understood this to have been the Will and Command of our Saviour, they could not have been so stupid, as to boast of their Disowning the Authority of *Pescennius* and *Albinus*, who were as much in Possession of two great Parts of the Empire, as *Septimius Severus* was of a third; but the Senate having declared for *Severus*, and required them to obey him only as their Emperor, they could not be look'd upon after that, by the (c) *Constitutions* of the Empire, as any other than *Usurpers* and *Rebels*. This was likewise the Case of several other Generals, and Governors of Provinces, who revolted from their Obedience. *Carausius* and *Allectus* were successively Masters of our Island, were proclaimed *Emperors* by their Armies, and assumed the Title of *Augusti* in their Coins, which are frequently dug up in this Kingdom; but by the *Roman* Laws they were Traitors; and as such were condemned by all honest Subjects. Now the Question is, how the Christians, who lived under these pretended *Emperors*, should behave themselves. By our Saviour's Law, says the Doctor, they owed Obedience to *Carausius* and *Allectus*, for they were in Possession of *Britain*, and could have shewed Money with their Image and Superscription upon it, which sufficiently demonstrated their Right; but by the established Constitution of the *Roman* Government, they were no better than *Rebels*; and whoever assisted them, were guilty of the same Crime.

(c) H. Grotius de Jure Belli & Pacis, l. 2. c. 9. sect. xi. Quæ olim jure potuit facere populus Romanus, antequam Imperatores Romani regnarent, idem faciendi jus habuit, ut quisque Imperator mortuus erat, alio nondum existente. Imo & Electio Imperatoris ad populum pertinebat, & aliquoties à populo per se,

aut per senatum facta est: quæ autem à legionibus, modò his, modò illis, fiebant electiones, non erant ratæ ex jure Legionum (nam in vulgo nomine jus certum esse non poterat) sed ex approbatione populi. Ubi vide Authoris Annotationes.



Thus, as the Doctor has contrived it, the *Christians* of those Ages must have been of all Men the most miserable in this World ; the Laws of their *Saviour* obliged them to one Thing, and those of the *Empire* to another ; and they might very justly have thought such a Condition insupportable.

O wearisome Condition of Humanity!

Born under one Law, to another bound.

By what Expedient will the Doctor now relieve us under these Difficulties ? Either we must be govern'd absolutely by the Laws of CHRIST ; or we are bound to obey the *Civil Constitutions* of the Country where we live : If the first is true, then it seems we are to be subject, and swear *Allegiance* to any one, who can shew his *Image* on his *Coin* ; but then it will follow, that there never was an *Usurper* in all the Time of the *Roman Empire* : Then it will be false, that our *Blessed Lord* intended to make no Change in the Government of the World, (d) which the Doctor thinks an important Truth : And then lastly, to the eternal Reproach of those, who have embraced his *Gospel*, we have found an Instance of a *Christian Law*, which never had any Authority in a *Christian Nation*. But if we are to be govern'd by the *Civil Constitutions* of our Country ; and it was never our *Saviour's* Design to destroy their Obligation ; to what Purpose then did he give his Disciples a Law, which he knew could never be observed ? And to what End has the Doctor urged it, against the known Practice of this Kingdom, as well as that of the *Roman Empire* ? For the Proceedings against the *Regicides*, and those who had adhered to *Cromwell*, are good Evidences, that our *Saviour's* Doctrine was never thought to be in Force here ; and the Reasons I have mention'd, may be sufficient to prove, it had as little Authority elsewhere. But to put this Matter out of Dispute, in Relation to the *Roman Empire*, I shall beg Leave to put the Doctor in Mind of the Story of the Tyrant *Maximus*, and that in the Words of a very (e) learned and judicious Writer.

(d) See the Preface to his Defence.

(e) The Author of The Title of a thorough Settlement examined, in Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance, p. 77, &c.

(f) Soſim. l. 7. c. 13. Socrat. l. 5. c. 11. Theodor. l. 5. c. 12.

(f) ' *Maximus*, after the Murder of *Gratian*, was in full Possession of the Western Empire ; for *Valentinian* left *Italy*, and fled to *Theſſalonica*, with his Mother, and *Probus*, the *Præſectus Prætorii* ; so that *Maximus* had

' the



the Government of all the West in his Power. St. Ambrose was at that Time persecuted by the Empress *Justina*, she being an *Arian*; and *Maximus* pretended to make War upon her Son *Valentinian* in his Behalf; yet no Man was more against the Proceedings of *Maximus*; than (g) St. Ambrose; and in the Negotiations he twice had with him, he maintain'd *Valentinian's* Cause with all the Freedom and Courage, that became a Christian Bishop. I know we have been told, (h) that all the Bishops of the West, not excepting the great St. Martin, who was called the Apostle of France, made their Applications to *Maximus*, and followed his Court, as much, if not more, than they did any Prince's of that Age. But it is worth taking Notice of, that these Bishops are much blamed for it by *Sulpicius Severus*; he says, they were notorious for their base and servile Flattery; (i) and he gives such a Character of *Ithacius*, one of the chief of them, as I wish no other Bishop may ever deserve. But St. Martin was of (k) another Temper; he frequently refused to accept of his Invitations to his Table; because he had deprived one Emperor of his Life, and another of his Kingdom; till at last, when *Maximus* had made the best Excuse he could, casting all the Blame upon the Soldiers, who had forced him to take upon him the Empire; and pretending, there was something more than humane in it; St. Martin did condescend to sit at the Table with him; and he at all (l) Times hinder'd him, as much as he could, from doing Mischief, and from breaking in upon the Privileges of the Church; which was not owning his Authority: For as *Sulpicius Severus* informs us, (m) he rather demanded, than petition'd for what he asked of him. But as the same Author represents him, (n) *Maximus* wanted nothing but a good Title, to make him an excellent Emperor; and St. Martin was willing to make the best Use of him he could, for the Benefit of the Church.

AFTER the Deaths of *Maximus* and *Eugenius*, St. Ambrose (o) says of them, that they were both in Hell,

(g) Ambros. Epist. 1. 7. ep. 56.

(h) Bishop of Sarum's Pastoral Letter,

P. 13.

(i) Sulpic. Severus Hist. 1. 2. c. 63.

(k) Idem in Vita Martini, c. 23.

(l) Idem Hist. 1. 2. c. 64.

(m) Idem in Vita Martini, c. 23.

(n) Idem in Dialog. c. 7.

(o) Ambros. Epist. 58. Et de obitu Theodosii.



‘teaching, by their miserable Examples, how sad a thing it is  
 ‘for Subjects to take up Arms against their Prince; of whom  
 ‘it is fitly said, I have seen the Wicked exalted, and lifted  
 ‘up above the Cedars of Libanus; and I passed by, and be-  
 ‘hold he was not; for the Righteous Man (meaning Theo-  
 ‘dosius and Gratian, whom he just before mention’d)  
 ‘passed from the Darkness of this World into Light Eternal;  
 ‘and the Wicked was not, who hath ceased to be unjust.  
 ‘Which must necessarily suppose, that *Maximus* and  
 ‘*Eugenius* were as guilty in retaining, as in acquiring  
 ‘their unjust Possessions; and that they ceased not to be  
 ‘unjust, till they died, and were no more in this World.  
 ‘It had been strangely uncharitable to have said, that  
 ‘they were both certainly damned, because they had  
 ‘rebelled some Years before their Deaths; if afterwards  
 ‘they became Lawful Emperors, and had so long  
 ‘Space for Repentance: But he supposed them to live  
 ‘and die in continual Usurpation, and therefore to be  
 ‘tormented in Hell after Death, as Usurpers and Re-  
 ‘bels.

(p) De exci-  
 dio Britan-  
 niz.

‘(p) OUR Countryman *Gildas* too gives such a De-  
 ‘scription of *Maximus*, as makes him no better, than  
 ‘an Usurper, from the Beginning to the End of his Go-  
 ‘vernment; he says, *he was advanced against Law, without*  
 ‘*any Title, or in a Tyrannical Manner; that he strengthen’d*  
 ‘*himself by Lies and Perjury, and continued his Usurpa-*  
 ‘*tion by the Murder of Gratian, and the Banishment of*  
 ‘*Valentinian, and was the same unjust Usurper to his*  
 ‘*Death.*

(q) Zof. l. 4.

‘(q) *Zosimus* indeed says, that *Theodosius* had consented,  
 ‘that *Maximus* should be acknowledged Emperor; and  
 ‘commanded his Statues to be set up, that he might, un-  
 ‘der a Shew of Kindness and Friendship, have the bet-  
 ‘ter Opportunity to ruin him; but this is against the  
 ‘Authority of all other Historians; and *Zosimus* never  
 ‘omits any Occasion to defame the Christian Empe-  
 ‘rors, and particularly *Theodosius*: And besides his Ha-  
 ‘tred to Christianity, which he exactly copied from  
 ‘*Eunapius*; whose History he is said to abridge; he  
 ‘is singular in other Circumstances, relating to this very  
 ‘Story.

‘BUT



(r) BUT it is more material to observe, that *Theodosius* declared all the Laws and Edicts of *Maximus* to be of no Force or Authority; and that this was no more, than the Christian Emperors used to do in such Cases. Which implies, that the Christians did not think, Tyrants and Usurpers received any Authority from GOD; for if they had, all their Acts, which had been according to Natural Right and Justice, must have been valid, as being made by such as had God's Authority to enact Laws, and decree Justice; and it would have been sinful to declare them void *ab initio*, and of no Effect. For if GOD had empower'd them to act as Emperors against the standing Laws and Constitutions of the Empire, he had authorized them to give out Edicts and Decrees, which must have been as obligatory in Conscience, as those of the lawful Emperors themselves; and whatever they wanted of the Formality of Law, ought to have been supplied by the lawful Emperors; and not all their Acts to have been declared invalid, and never to have been of any Authority or Obligation. St. *Ambrose* was not the Bishop, who would tamely have seen GOD's Authority in his Vicegerents thus despised; but *Theodosius* would have found him the same Man, that he did upon some other Occasions, if this had been the Doctrine of the Church."

THUS that worthy Author has very accurately shewn, that the Christians did not look upon *Maximus*, as any other than an Usurper, notwithstanding the Extent of his Dominions, and the Greatness of his Power: And he proceeds to prove, they had no better Opinion of *Eugenius*; though he was much superiour to *Theodosius* in Strength, and commanded a more numerous Army.

BEFORE I leave this Subject, I would humbly offer it to be considered, whether our *Saviour's* Answer to the *Pharisees* would not be more intelligible, and the Force of his Argument better understood, if we should say, the Money he demanded a Sight of, was coined by the *Jews* themselves? For then we may conceive, he rea-

(r) Omne judicium quod vestrâ mente conceptum; injuriâ, non jura reddendo *Maximus* infandissimus Tyrannorum credidit promulgandum, damnabimus; nul-

lus igitur sibi lege ejus, nullus judicio blandiatur. Theodos. Cod. l. 15. Tit. 14. de infirmandis his quæ sub Tyrannis aut Barbaris gesta sunt.



son'd with them after this Manner: 'Do you pretend to  
'question the Lawfulness of Paying Tribute to *Cæsar*,  
'who have stamped his Image upon your Coins for that  
'Purpose, after the Custom of Conquer'd Countries?  
'You, who have been scrupulous in paying this Com-  
'pliment to the best of your Princes, and yet are now  
'guilty of a viler Submission, than any others of the  
'*Roman* Subjects. Behold here your own Act and Deed,  
'your own Money witnesses against you, and deter-  
'mines the Controversy: For how came *Cæsar's* Image  
'upon your Coin, if you have not acknowledged him  
'for your Sovereign? And if he is your Sovereign, why  
'should you scruple to pay him Tribute? *Render there-  
'fore to Cæsar the Things that be Cæsar's, &c.*

IN Favour of this Conjecture (for I propose it only  
as such) I have already cited the Opinion of very learn-  
ed Men, who have been willing to own, that the *Jews*  
were allowed the Liberty of Coining their own Money  
by the *Romans*; but it must be confessed, they are much  
of a Mind, that it was not consistent with their Laws to  
stamp any Humane Effigies upon it; and consequently  
they think it necessary to affirm, that the *Tribute-Money*  
was struck by the *Romans* themselves. Now, with all  
due Submission to better Judgments, I see no sufficient  
Evidence for this Assertion: For, *First*, If their (s) Law  
(s) Exod. which forbids the Making of any *Graven Image*, or any  
xx. 4. *Likeness of any Thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in  
the Earth beneath, or that is in the Water under the Earth*;  
if this Law, I say, must be understood absolutely, with-  
out any Limitation; then *Aaron's Rod*, and the *Pot of  
Manna*, or *Incense*, which are found upon the *Jewish  
Sicles*, were illegal Images, and not to be defended by  
the Law of *Moses*; and then, if they could dispense  
with themselves in this Point, why might they not as  
well allow themselves the Liberty of Stamping *Cæsar's  
Image* on their Coin?

*Secondly*, If we consider the End, for which the *Jews*  
were forbid by their Laws to make any *Graven Images*, it  
will follow, that it was equally unlawful for them to  
purchase or possess any *Images* already made by others;  
for why were they prohibited to make any *Graven Images*,  
but only lest they should put them to a Religious Use,  
and worship them as the Heathen did? And can it then  
be



be denied, but the same ill Consequence might follow, if they were allowed to admit and retain in their Houses such only, as were the Workmanship of foreign Artists? Besides, GOD had as strictly forbidden the Possession of Images, as he had the Making of them; for his Commands are peremptory, that in all their Conquests over the Heathen, they should be sure to (t) burn their *Pictures*, and destroy *their graven Images*. What shall we say then to this Case of the *Tribute-Money*, which had *Cæsar's Image* upon it, and yet was as much handled and used by the *Jews*, as any of their own *Sicles*? Is it not then plain, they had no Scruple in carrying about with them their *Emperor's Images* on their Coins? And why then should it be held unlawful for the like Money to come out of their own Mint? We are farther encouraged in this Opinion by the Testimony of the *Jewish Doctors*, who generally agree, that even *Statues* themselves (which certainly are more liable to Objection, than bare Heads upon Medals, and those only *in Profile*) were (u) allowable in the Houses of the *Jews*, provided they were kept only for Ornament-sake, as Pieces of Household-Stuff, and not upon a Religious Account. And therefore (x) *W. Schikard* (an Author well-esteem'd of for his Knowledge in the *Jewish Customs*) has for this very Reason defended the Lawfulness of their stamping an *Image* upon their Coins; and he informs us, that those very *Rabbins*, who would not permit the Possession of entire *Statues*, would yet allow of such *Sculptures*, as had only a Head or Face upon them. *Josephus* indeed seems to be of a contrary Opinion, as if all manner of *Images* were utterly prohibited by the Divine Law, and it were unlawful for a *Jew* to be so much as the Owner and Possessor of them. But (y) *Mr. Selden* has observed, that *Josephus* herein, as he does upon many other Occasions, differs from the *Talmudical Doctors*, and therefore his Authority is not great among the *Jews*: Besides, when all the Passages which are urged from his History, upon this Controversy, are duly consider'd, they will be found on-

(t) Exod. xxxiv. 13. Numb. xxxiii. 52. Deut. vii. 5.

(u) *Selden de Jure Nat. & Gent. juxta Hebræos. L. 2. c. 7. &c. 3.*

(x) *W. Schikard Tarich Regum Persiæ, in Proëm. p. 35.*

(y) *De Jure Nat. & Gent. L. 2. c. 8.*



ly to prove, that such *Images* were never to be endured within the *Jewish* Government, which were originally intended for Idolatrous Uses; or were purposely form'd and erected to do Dishonour to the God of *Israel*. Thus for instance, *Josephus* (z) tells us, that when *Pilate* caused some *Roman* Soldiers to march into *Jerusalem* with the *Busts* of *Cæsar* wrought upon their Ensigns, the *Jews* tumultuously exclaim'd against it as an open Subversion of their Laws, and would not be pacified, till he had removed those Occasions of Offence out of their Sight. Now the Reason of this was plain; the (a) *Romans* paid a Religious Worship to their Ensigns; the chief (b) Standard of their *Legions* bore an *Eagle* at the Top of it, in a little Shrine; and certainly was accounted more Sacred by those Idolaters, when the Pourtraitures of their Emperors were the more conspicuous Ornaments of it. So that if we shall still affirm, that the bare Heads of their Emperors (without any Regard to the Divine Honours paid to them) created that Abhorrence in the *Jews*; we shall find it impossible to give a Reason, why those which were upon the *Roman* Coins, should give them no manner of Disturbance. Again, the same Historian (c) relates, that *Herod* having erected a golden *Eagle* over the great Gate of the Temple, the *Jews* look'd upon this as an Affront to their Law, and would not be at rest till they had pull'd it down; but this likewise can only serve to shew, that they thought their Temple profaned by such an Image; and does not prove the Unlawfulness of being Owner of the like Sculptures, when only intended as Furniture for private Houses. I shall only now add, that had it been reputed so high a Crime in a *Jew*, to stamp an Image upon his Coin; either *Agrippa* the Great (who is represented to us by (d) *Philo* and (e) *Josephus* as a zealous Observer of the Laws of his Religion) would not have been (f) guilty

(z) *Josephus* Archæol. l. 18. c. 4.

(a) *Tertullian*. Apolog. Religio Romanorum tota Castrensis Signa veneratur, Signa jurat, Signa omnibus Diis proponit.

(b) *Dion Cassius*, l. 40. speaking of the Roman Ensign, Ἐστὶ δὲ νεὼς μικρὴ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀνέστη χρυσεὶς ἐνίδρυς, &c.

(c) *Archæol.* l. 17. c. 8. Et de Bello Jud. l. 1. c. 21.

(d) *Philo* Judæus in Legat. ad Caium.

(e) *Archæol.* l. 18. c. 7. Καὶ τὰ πάρετα καθαρώς ἐτήρησεν· διὰ πάντων γὰρ αὐτὸν ἦγεν ἀγνείας, ἐδὲ ἡμεῖς τις παρώδισεν αὐτῷ τὸ νόμιμα χρυσεὶα δοῦναι, &c.

(f) See an Account of one of his Coins with a Head upon it, and the Inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΕΤΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΣ, in *Hardouin* de nummis Herodiadum, p. 15. Et *Ez. Spanhem.* de Præst. Numism. Diss. 8. p. 523. Vol. 1. fol.



of it ; or *Josephus* (who is forward enough to take notice of any Slips of this Nature in the *Jewish* Princes) would not have fail'd to censure him for it. And now from these Observations I am willing to conclude, that the Conjecture I have propos'd, has some Shew of Probability on its side ; but nothing will give it a better Countenance, than a Comparison with that, which asserts the *Romans* themselves to have been *Coiners* of the *Tribute-Money*, whereof we are now speaking.

THE common Exposition is this ; *Cæsar* coins Money now in *Judea*, therefore he is in Possession of that Country ; and consequently is the lawful Governor of it. Here we have the several Propositions in their natural Order, and the full Course of our *Saviour's* Argument. But if this is a right State of the Matter, it will follow, that our *Saviour* us'd a great deal of Art and Contrivance to prove that, which was not in the Question ; for he calls for a Sight of the *Tribute-Money*, and demands what was the Image and Supercription, for no other End and Purpose, but only to prove, that *Cæsar* was in Possession of *Judea*, of which no Man then living in that Country could possibly doubt : For the *Roman* Legions and Governors every where demonstrated, who were their Masters ; and would not suffer any Scruples to arise in their Minds upon that Account. But, Secondly, it is confessed, the Question put by the *Pharisees* was concerning the Title of these Governors ; whether they had sufficient Authority to challenge Subjection, and might be obeyed as Lawful Sovereigns : But to this it cannot be said (according to *Grotius* and his Followers) that our *Saviour* gave any satisfactory Answer ; for to affirm (as those Gentlemen have done) that he inferr'd *Cæsar's* Right from his Possession, is to tell the World, that he maintain'd Consequences, which did not follow from their Premises, and introduced a new *Logick* as well as Law.

ANOTHER Conjecture, much favoured by very eminent Authors, is this ; That the Inscription upon the *Tribute-Money* was very probably *Judæa Capta* ; and therefore the *Jews*, by paying their Taxes in such Coin, did in Effect acknowledge, they were a Conquer'd People, and consequently bound to comply with such Demands of the *Victors*, as necessary for the Preservation of their



Lives, and remaining Liberties; for supposing the *Roman* Conquest never so unjust, it might be lawful however to pay them Tribute; which was the Point the *Pharisees* pretended to be scrupulous in. But this Opinion has the Misfortune to want a Foundation to support it; for, by the Confession of all Learned Men, no such Coin, with *Judæa Capta*, has hitherto been met with, before *Vespasian's* Reign. (g) *Osco*, it is true, mentions one of *Augustus* with that Inscription upon it, which he believes was coined upon the Taking of *Jerusalem* by *Sosius*: But it is observable, he never saw it; for he does not tell us, what the Metal was; which he never fails to do, when he gives an Account of Medals he had seen, or was well inform'd about them. (h) *Mr. Selden* confesses, he could never hear of any such Coin; and none of the Antiquaries since his Time (after the most diligent Enquiries that could be made) have been able to discover such a Curiosity. Besides, it is not to be imagin'd, that any such Coin should be struck by *Augustus*, or in Compliment to him; for *Jerusalem* was never taken by him, or any of his *Generals*: During the *Triumvirate* indeed, the Eastern Part of the *Roman* Dominions being allotted to *M. Anthony*, he ordered *Sosius*, one of his *Lieutenants*, to lay Siege to *Jerusalem*; who soon made himself Master of it, and placed *Herod* in the Throne; but the Honour of that Action belonged entirely to *M. Anthony* and *Sosius*, not in the least to *Augustus*; who therefore cannot be supposed capable of arrogating to himself the Glory of a Victory, which was by no means his Due.

I RETURN now to the Doctor, who being resolved to dispute every Thing asserted by his Adversaries, calls in Question the Authority of the *Cæsars*, particularly of *Tiberius*; and will not allow him a Right to govern, either the *Romans*, or *Jews*. If we grant the *Lex Regia* to be genuine, says our (i) Author, (which hath been denied in a *Traët de Fictione Legis Regiæ*) yet what is this to *Tiberius's* Title? The *Lex Regia* did not entail the Em-

(g) *Oecon. Numism.* p. 52. Captis à Sosio Hierosolymis. ΚΑΙ ΣΑΡ ΑΤ-  
ΦΟΥΣΤ. caput Augusti ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΣ

ΕΛΛΟΚΤΙΑΣ. Victoria Palma innitens  
cernua in clypeo hæc scribens.

(h) *De jure Nat. & Gent.* l. 6. c. 17.

(i) *Viem.* p. 89.



pire on Augustus's Posterity; and if it had, Tiberius was none of them.

HERE we see the Doctor doubts of the Credit of the *Lex Regia*; however he is positive, that *Tiberius* could derive no Benefit from it. But why does he suspect the *Lex Regia* to be a Forgery? Truly for this admirable Reason, because a certain (k) *Dutch* Writer has been of this Opinion, in a Treatise upon that Subject. The Doctor should not, methinks, have forgot *Buchanan* upon this Occasion (as good an Author as that he has cited) who, in his Book *de Jure Regni apud Scotos*, first made Objections against the Validity of this Law; but I must beg Leave to tell him, that (l) *Archbishop Usher*, (m) *Mr. Selden*, and (n) *Mr. Thorndike*, (whose Judgment will always deserve as much Regard, as the Person's he refers to) were of another Persuasion. The Account they give of this Matter, is this; That in the Beginning of the Roman Empire the *Lex Regia* was made, by which the People conferred upon the Prince all manner of Power and Authority; and this they assure us, is attested by *Ulpian*, and *Justinian*, in his *Institutes*. Besides, there is this day extant in the *Capitol*, a Fragment of that Law, in which the Powers bestowed upon *Vespasian* by the *Senate*, are recited; and they are there said to be such, as his Predecessors had enjoyed. Which now of these two Laws will the Doctor, or his Author, have to be a Fiction? Is it that mention'd by *Ulpian*? Surely that is impossible; it is not certainly to be imagined, that so eminent a Man would endeavour to impose upon the *Romans* in a Matter they could as easily know as himself. Must we say then, that the Fragment relating to *Vespasian* is a Cheat? But this would not be for the Doctor's Purpose, were it true; and besides, we are well informed of the contrary; for (o) *Monseignor Bianchini* (a Person of no mean Figure in the Common-

(k) I guess the Doctor's Author is *Martin Schoekius*.

(l) *The Power of the Prince*, p. 68.

(m) *Selden's Titles of Honour*, c. 5. p. 2. p. 591. and in his *Notes on Fleta*.

(n) *Thorndike's Review of the Primitive Government of Churches*, c. 12. p. 48; 49.

(o) *Quamobrem, nec falsi damnaverim fragmentum hoc, quod non satis*

*prudenter aliqui fecerunt; cum dictione, scriptura, & notarum Lineamentis convincantur erroris sui; ut duo nostrorum temporum clarissima Romanæ antiquitatis lumina observarunt, Blanchinus & Fabrettus, quorum Testimonium ad hujus Libri extremum adjiciemus. Vincentius Gravina de ortu & progressu Juris Civilis, ed. Lipsiæ, p. 139.*



wealth of Learning) has given it under his Hand, that after an accurate Examination of that Monument, he found all the genuine Marks and Signs of Antiquity upon it ; and wonder'd, that any should suspect it to be a Counterfeit. However, the Doctor asks, *what is this to Tiberius's Title?* Now this Question is answer'd by this Fragment of *Vespasian's Lex Regia* ; for in it 'we (p) find (besides the Power (q) of *entring into what Leagues and Treaties he pleased*, and many other Privileges) 'the high Prerogative confirmed to him, (r) that to 'what Laws soever, either of the Senate or People, it 'was ordained, that the Emperors *Augustus, Tiberius,* 'and *Claudius* were not tied, from those he should be 'loose also; which, according to the Mind of the Civilians, is expressed thus ;" (s) *They are loosed from the Laws (as the Letter of their own Language speaks) that is, they are free from all coercive Obedience to them, and are held by none of the written Ordinances.* From whence it is evident, that *Vespasian* was to enjoy the same Privileges and Prerogatives, that *Augustus* and *Tiberius* did ; but they had no Prerogatives, but what were given them by the Senate and People ; and because all the several Branches of the Imperial Authority were specified in the Grant, the ancient *Lawyers* gave it the Name of *Lex Regia*. But I shall not contend with the Doctor about this Nicety ; for I do not conceive it to be at all material, by what Appellation the *Law* was distinguished, which conferred the Sovereign Authority upon *Tiberius*, provided the Fact can be proved, that by some such publick Instrument they did really part with their (t) Liberties, and devolve all their Power upon that Emperor. Now I think this may be demonstrated beyond all Contradiction, not only from this Inscription, but also from the *Roman Historians*, who abundantly supply us with Evidence for this Purpose.

(p) *These are Archbishop Usher's own Words, in his Power of the Prince,* p. 68.

(q) *Fœdusve cum quibus volet facere liceat.* Vide Gruteri Inscript. Tom. 1. p. 242. Ed. Amstel. 1707.

(r) *Utique quibus Legibus plebisve scitis scriptum fuit, ne Divus Augustus, Tiberiusve Julius Caesar Augustus, Tiberiusque Claudius Caesar Aug. Germanicus*

*tenerentur, iis Legibus plebisque scitis Imp. Caesar Vespasianus solutus sit, ibid.* Vide etiam Dion. Cass. l. 53. p. 516.

(s) *Dion Cassius, Hist. Rom. l. 53. λέγων ὅτι νόμων, ὡς αὐτὰ τὰ Λατινικὰ ῥήματα λέγει, τέτεστιν, ὑπὸ πάσης ἀναγκῆς νομίσσεως εἶσι, καὶ ἐδὲν ὅτι γεγραμμένων ἐνέχον.*

(t) *Dion Cassius, l. 53. p. 518, 519.*



UPON the Death of *Augustus*, nothing was ever more remarkable, than the Contention between the People of *Rome* and *Tiberius*; the first in their Endeavours to impose, the latter to decline the Empire. The (u) Senate fell upon their Knees to him upon that Account; and the ablest of their Orators solicited him in the most earnest and importunate manner, to take the Government upon him; so that at length he was rather subdued, than persuaded; and it seem'd evident, that he accepted of the Imperial Dignity more to gratify others, than to please himself. (x) It was wonderful to see, with what Haste and Precipitation Persons of the highest Rank and Quality labour'd to part with their Liberties: The *Consuls* first began to take the Oath to him; soon after the *Senate*, the *Soldiers*, and the *People*; and all this Forwardness was shewn, before he would vouchsafe to give them Hopes of being their *Emperor*. He was no sooner upon the Throne, but the *Senate* offer'd him (y) all manner of Honours, Titles, and Powers; and in a word, no *publick Act* was done by him, which could not sufficiently be warranted and justified by his (z) *Tribunian*, *Consular*, *Proconsular*, and *Pontifical* Authority; or that of some other Offices; with which he was invested by Decrees of the *Senate*. So that the Doctor will be hard put to it to prove, that *Augustus* had more Authority conferred upon him by the *Senate*, than they gave to *Tiberius*; Indeed we may venture to say it, that the *Senate* was never more profuse in their Oblations to any Emperor, than they were to *Tiberius*; and therefore if their Consent and Approbation was sufficient to make him a *Rightful* Governor, he certainly had it in as great a Degree, as his Predecessor could pretend to. Is it not then surprizing, what the (a) Doctor tells us, that *Tiberius* wound himself into the Government, and the Submission of the Romans (such as it was) was his only Title? As if the Romans had ever made an humbler Submission to any of their *Emperors*; and the Submission of a People that had

(u) Tacit. Annal. l. i. c. 11. Sueton. in Vita Tiberii, c. 24. Tandem quasi coactus, & querens miseram & onerosam sibi injungi servitutem, recepit Imperium.

(x) Tacit. Annal. l. i. c. 7. Romæ ruere in Servitium Consules, Patres, Eque. Quanto quis Illustrior, tanto ma-

gis falsi ac festinantes. Consules primi in verba Cæsaris juraverè, mox Senatus, milesque & Populus.

(y) Dion Cassius, l. 57. p. 602, 607. & l. 58. p. 629, 632.

(z) Dion Cassius, l. 53. p. 508, 509. c. 518, 519.

(a) *Vien*, p. 90.



their Liberties entirely at their own Disposal, were not sufficient to create a good Title.

HIS next Question is, (b) *Whether the Romans themselves were Rightful Governors of Judæa?* And the Reason of his Doubt is, because *there appears no express Act of the Resignation of the Sovereign Power to the Romans, like that of the Lex Regia to Augustus.* If nothing less than the very Instrument of Resignation will satisfy the Doctor, we cannot help it; but there are many other Learned and Judicious Men in the World, who will be contented with (c) *Josephus's Authority* in this Matter. I need not trouble the Reader with all the Particulars of this Piece of History; for what Reasons *Pompey* laid Siege to *Jerusalem* and took it; and how the *Jews* came first under Subjection to the *Romans*: It is certain, that *Hircanus*, their Lawful King, was the great Instrument of bringing them under this Yoke; for it was his Party, that surrender'd *Jerusalem* to *Pompey*; and by his Consent the *Romans* were first admitted into a Share of the Government of that Country; and he contented himself with the Title of (d) *King*, under the *Roman Protection*: Upon this Account (e) *learned Men* have affirm'd, that the *Jews* made a *Dedition* of themselves at that Time, and were ever after bound, by their own voluntary Act, to pay Obedience to the *Romans*, as their lawful Masters and Governors. By Virtue of this Power and Authority, *Augustus* constituted *Herod* King of *Judæa*, and afterwards his Son *Archelaus*; but not long after *Archelaus* being deprived of his Kingdom, and sent into Banishment, (f) *Judæa* was then first reduced into the Form of a *Roman Province* by *Augustus*; and the Government of

(b) *View*, p. 90.

(c) *He says, the whole Nation of the Jews swore to Augustus, and Herod, excepting the Pharisees.* Archæol. l. 17. c. 3.

(d) *Dion Cassius*, p. 37. & *Joseph. l. 1. de Bello Jud. c. 8.*

(e) *The Author of the Exercitation concerning Usurped Powers*, p. 87. Ed. 1650, 4to. And *Doctor Hammond on Matth. xxii. v. 16.*

(f) *Id. Casaubon. exerc. adv. Baronium, App. N. 6. Exerc. I.* And *Josephus informs us*, (Archæol. l. 17. c. 12.) that this was what the *Jews* themselves desired, upon the Death of *Herod*; for they

sent an Embassy to *Augustus*, of Fifty of the principal Men of their Nation, beseeching him, that they might be no longer govern'd by Kings, but for the future, as a Part of the Province of Syria, their Country might be under the Administration of a Roman Magistrate, appointed by the Emperor; and in this Request they were seconded by Eight Thousand Jews, who were then Inhabitants of Rome. Ἡν δὲ κεφάλαιον αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀξιόσεως βασιλείας, καὶ ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ λαλῆσαι. περὶ δὲ τῆς Σουλῆς γεγονότας, ἀποστέλλειν τοῖς ἐκείσε πεμπομένοις ἑκατὺροῖς. Which is another very remarkable Instance of their voluntary Subjection to the *Romans*.



it committed to a *Procurator* under the *President* of *Syria*. This was the State of the *Jews* at the Time of our *Saviour's* Death, and for some Years before; and whatever the Doctor may think of it, there was no Conscientious *Jew* then in Being, but might safely have sworn Allegiance to the *Roman Emperors*. For what Prince, or Family would have been injured by it? Or was there any one living, who could pretend a better Right to the Sovereign Power over them? The Sons of *Herod* were under an absolute Dependency upon the *Cæsars*, and therefore could not presume to lay any Claim to that Monarchy; and the Race of the (g) *Asamonæi*, the old Hereditary Kings of the *Jews*, was entirely extinct: The *Romans* therefore could not possibly be *Usurpers*, when no Title could be set up against them; and for that very Reason were lawful *Possessors*; because no Proprietor was in Being, who could charge them with doing him Injustice. In this Case, *Self-Preservation*, and the *Publick Good* (Principles too often abused upon other Occasions) did oblige the *Jews* to submit to the *Romans*, and acknowledge their Authority, even though they had never before yielded themselves up to their Government; for though, upon the utter Extinction of a *Royal Family*, Subjects are at Liberty to choose the next Successor who shall reign over them; yet if any Person, in such a Juncture, shall get Possession of the vacant Throne, even by Force and Violence; it is then so much for their Interest, that it becomes their Duty, to comply with the Necessity of Affairs, and suffer him to be their King, whom they cannot attempt to depose, without the apparent Ruin of their Lives and Fortunes. Thus the Doctor sees, his Adversaries are willing to allow, that Possession gives a Right in certain Cases; viz. when the Subjects preserve themselves by yielding Obedience to the King *de Facto*, without violating the Rights of a Third Person: But this Concession will do him no

(g) Josephus assures us, (Archæol. l. 15. c. 9.) that for this Reason Herod destroyed Hircanus, because his Right and Title to the Kingdom of Judæa by Blood was unquestionable; a little before that, he had caused Aristobulus (the Grandson of Hircanus) to be drown'd, Archæol. l. 15. c. 3. Soon after he dispatches his own Wife Mariamne, Sister to Aristobulus;

and having exercis'd the same Cruelty upon the Children of Baba, the Historian says, there was not then one left of the Kindred of Hircanus. "Ὡς ἐν μὲν ἀπολοιπὸν ἐκ τῆς ἑρκανίου συγγενείας, ἀλλὰ τὴ βασιλείαν αὐτεξέσιον αὐτοῦ, μὴδὲν οὐτὸ ἐν ἀξιώματι ἐμποδὼν ἰσαδαι τοῖς ἀγαρμοῦσιν."



Good in his main Question, and hurts him in that which concerns the Authority of the *Roman* Emperor, over the *Jews*; for in this latter Case, as I have now stated it, it was plainly lawful for them at least, to become their Subjects; and every thing rightly consider'd, their Duty too. It should be observ'd, that had the *Romans* withdrawn their *Legions* and Protection, at *Herod's* Death, and abandon'd the *Jews* to their own Conduct and Disposal; the Sons of *Herod* would soon have torn their Country in Pieces; and whoever had prevail'd, had ruled them with the utmost Degree of Tyranny. On the other hand, they had long Experience of the Humanity and Goodness of the *Romans* to them, by many extraordinary (b) Decrees made in their Favour; and (i) *Philo Judæus* has given us a large Account of the particular Kindnesses shew'd to them by *Augustus* and *Tiberius*; so that had they been left to their free Choice, they could not have made a wiser, than to live under the Government of those *Emperors*. The Doctor indeed fancies, it will be some Refuge to him to (k) say, that the *Jews* were forced to this Submission to a superiour Power; but I have shewn, it was their Interest; and certainly that Violence is very agreeable and obliging, which compels Men to do Things, that are highly for their Advantage; that is, as becomes Rational Creatures. But should we allow it to be true, that this Submission of the *Jews* was forced and extorted; it cannot possibly do the Doctor any Service. For will he say, that Promises and Oaths obtain'd by Violence, from a People that had Power to make them, are of no Obligation? What then will become of Leagues and Treaties between Princes, after a long and bloody War, when disadvantageous Conditions of Peace are imposed upon the unsuccessful Party, and they must either accept of them, or resolve to prosecute the War to their evident Ruin? Will the Doctor maintain, that these Treaties are Void and of no Effect, and that the Princes, who were forced to comply with these Terms, may lawfully have Recourse to Arms again, whenever they see an Opportunity? The Doctor knows, that *Grotius*, and *Sanderfon*, and all the ablest Casuists are of another Opinion; and he will find it difficult to answer their Arguments. I shall only beg Leave to put him in mind, upon this Occasion, of the

(b) Vide  
*Decreta Romana, &c.*  
*pro Judæis,*  
nuper à Gro-  
novio edita.

(i) In Le-  
gat. ad Cai-  
um.

(k) *Videm,*  
p. 90.



Judgment of two great Historians, relating to this Question:

Francis I. King of France, having been taken Prisoner by the Emperor Charles V, was some time after set at Liberty upon his Parole of Honour, by which he obliged himself to return again to the Emperor, if the Conditions were not perform'd, upon which he was released. But Francis being once at Liberty, pretended he was not bound by the Promises he had made in Captivity, affirming, *that no Man under Ward could plight his Faith*: Upon which my (l) Lord Herbert makes this Reflexion: *(l) Life of Henry VIII. ad ann. 1528.* Nevertheless, I must not omit to say, *that the Excuse of Francis was not generally approv'd of, nor his Cartel thought just; for if a Prisoner of War may avoid his Promise, because he made it under a Constraint, it would follow, that few or none would be taken Prisoners, but kill'd upon the Place; which would make the War not only more bloody and barbarous, but even destroy a principal Part of that Jus Gentium, which in these Cases has been inviolably observ'd. in all Times.*

THE other Historian is the present Bishop of Salisbury, who tells us, That King Henry VIII. having prevail'd with the Convocation to annull his Marriage with the Lady Anne of Cleves, one of the Reasons which influenced that Assembly was this, *(m) That the King having married her against his Will, he had not given a pure, inward, and complete Consent: And since a Man's Act is only what is inward, extorted or forced Promises do not bind.* But the Bishop's Censure upon these Proceedings is remarkable. *This was (says his (n) Lordship) the greatest Piece of Compliance, that ever the King had from the Clergy; for as they all knew, there was nothing of Weight in the Pre-Contract; so they laid down a most pernicious Precedent for invalidating all Publick Treaties and Agreements: Since if one of the Parties being unwilling to it, so that his Consent were not inward, he was not bound by it; there was no Safety among Men more. For no Man can know, whether another consents inwardly: And when a Man does any thing with a great Aversion, to infer from thence, that he does not inwardly consent, may furnish every one with an Excuse, to break loose from all Engagements; for he may pretend he did it unwillingly. Lastly, The Doctor has acknowledged, that Zedekiah and the Jews submitted to the King of Babylon,*

A a a a

and



(o) 2 Chron.  
xxxvi. 13.  
*It is said,*  
*That Nebu-*  
*chadnezzar*  
*had made*  
*Zedekiah*  
*swear by God*  
*to him.*  
(p) Ezek.  
xvii. 15, &c.

and took an Oath to him, before God had commanded them to do so: But surely they did not make this Submission willingly; it was the (o) Effect of Force and Violence, which they must either have complied with, or exposed themselves to utter Ruin: May we say therefore, with the Doctor, that their Oaths and Engagements signified nothing, and could not bind them against the Interest of their Country? But the (p) Prophet has taught us another Doctrine, he tells us God was highly incensed by the Violation of the Oath and Covenant made to the King of *Babylon*, and threatens them with the Severity of His Vengeance upon that Account. The Prophet's Words are remarkable, and therefore I shall conclude with them. *Shall he prosper? Shall he escape that doth such things? Or, shall he break the Covenant, and be deliver'd? As I live, saith the LORD GOD, surely in the Place where the King dwelleth, that made him King, whose Oath he despised, and whose Covenant he brake, even with him, in the midst of Babylon shall he die. Seeing he despised the Oath, by breaking the Covenant (when lo! He had given His Hand) and hath done all these things, he shall not escape.*





# APPENDIX.

## NUMB. I.

Ad p. 96.

A Passage out of Sir J. Fortescue's Defence of the Title of the House of Lancaster. MS. Bibl. Cotton. Otho, B. i.



O S T Henrici 5<sup>ti</sup> fata Christianissimus Princeps Henricus 6<sup>us</sup>; ejus filius & Hæres, Parentum suorum æquo & justo titulo, in jure Coronæ & Regni Angliæ successit; tenerri-  
mæque ætate in Regni ejusdem Regem, nullo contradicente, sed uno omnium applausu, un-

ctus & coronatus est. Cui etiam adhuc inter ubera volutanti, & nondum coronato, præfatus Edmundus Comes Marchiæ, tanquam hæredi ejusdem Henrici 5<sup>ti</sup>, Regique ac Domino suo supremo, cum omni humilitate ultro ligeum fecit homagium, & ad hoc faciendum quàm celerrimè potuit libentissimè prope-  
ravit.

Postea verò dicto Edmundo Comite sine Hæredibus de corpore suo exeuntibus à rebus humanis exempto, Richardus nuper Dux Eboracensis, Pater istius Edwardi, & nepos istius Edmundi, viz. filius Annæ sororis suæ, tanquam proximus sibi hæres, in Cancellariâ ejusdem Regis Henrici 6<sup>ti</sup>, secundum modum Curia illius, possessionem dicti Comitatus sibi, tanquam proximo hæredi ipsius Edmundi, ab eodem Rege, tanquam à Domino suo supremo, deliberari petiit & obtinuit. Et ob hoc eadem, ut suo Regi & supremo Domino, Homagium Ligeum fecit; & postea, suis indenturis, Sigillo armorum & signo suo manuali signatis, dicto Regi suo Henrico 6<sup>to</sup> se obligavit, de se fideliter gerendo & habendo in officio Locum Tenentis sui in Franciâ, quod & diu fecit. In quibus scriptis ipsum Henricum Dominum suum supremum, Angliæque & Franciæ Regem



nominabat. Posteaque à partibus Franciæ ad Angliam reversus, similibus suis scriptis indentatis, suoque sigillo armorum unà cum signo manuali suo signatis, ad fideliter serviendum eidem Domino suo supremo in officio Locum-tenentis sui in Hiberniâ, quoad placeret Regi ipsum revocare, omnibus modo, viâ, & formâ juris, quibus melius potuit, se astringit & obligavit; Ipsumque Regem Henricum Sextum, in illis etiam scriptis suis, supremum Dominum suum, Regemque Angliæ & Franciæ, semper profitendo, nominavit.

Iterum etiam, dum Rex Henricus tantâ ægritudine vexatus fuerat, quòd Regni sui gubernaculis personaliter intendere non valuit; dictus Richardus Dux Eboracensis, scriptis suis sigillo armorum, suoque signo manuali notatis, ipsum Regem sponte Dominum suum supremum, Regemque Angliæ & Franciæ nominavit; & in publico Parlamento, durante infirmitate illâ, Protectoris & Defensoris Angliæ officium, auctoritate ejusdem Parlamenti, in se assumpsit, pleno corpore Regni in Parlamento illo, & secundum jura Angliæ representato; & dictum Christianissimum Principem Henricum Sextum, Regem Angliæ, suumque supremum Dominum in plenâ Curiâ Parlamenti illius de Recordo appellavit; cùmque tunc temporis Rex ipse, obstante infirmitate prædictâ, nullum sibi ad sic faciendum timorem incutere potuit.

Item idem Richardus, vice repetitâ, supra sacrum Corpus Christi sacramentaliter visum juravit, quòd semper fidelis subditus & Ligeus esset eidem Regi suo Henrico Sexto, & pro posse suo defenderet & adjuvaret, atque pro viribus suis totis ad Statûs sui Regii conservationem incrementumque ageret, & ad ejus confirmationem Corpus Christi recepit. Quibus juramentis non modò corpus, sed animam suam, suumque honorem strictius fortiusque, quàm aliquo temporali vinculo potuit, obligavit.

Edwardus etiam iste filius suus, jam Regni Usurpator, consimiliter in præsentia Cleri totius Provinciæ Cantuariensis, ad tunc convocati in Ecclesiâ S. Pauli Londonij, super crucem Cantuariensem juravit solemniter, quòd semper honoraret Dominum suum supremum Regem Henricum 6<sup>um</sup>, ipsumque pro Rege Angliæ ac Domino suo supremo acciperet, & sibi humiliter, ut Regi suo, totâ vitâ suâ obediret, & postea in publico Parlamento juramentum suum repetiit pariter & renovavit.

Ex quibus præmissis liquet æquo intuentibus lumine, quòd si Progenitores Edwardi hujus nunc usurpantis, à principio jus aliquod ad coronam & regnum Angliæ habuissent, quemadmodum



dum nunquam habuerunt; ab illo tamen jure per promissiones & affirmationes suas, sub sigillis & signis suis manualibus roboratas, per Renunciationes spontaneas, tam tacitas quam expressas, etiam in Parlamento & Convocatione Cleri, quæ maximæ auctoritatis sunt, affirmatas, & per juramenta solennia sponte facta, recessum est plenariè & absolutè: Adeoque si habuissent jus, prout non habuerunt, omnis tamen via petendi illud, eis eorum, facto proprio præclusa est, idemque jus in lege adnihilatum extat & extinctum.

N U M B. II.

Ad p. 96.

*The whole Proceedings of Richard Duke of York's Claim of the Crown against Henry VI, and the Judgment of the House of Peers thereupon, as it is transcrib'd from the Parliament Rolls in Dr. Brady's Enquiry into the remarkable Instances of History, and Parliament Records, used by the Author of The Unreasonableness of a New Separation on Account of the Oaths, &c. p. 31. to 39. With Dr. Brady's Inferences from thence against that Author.*

Memorand. **T**HAT the xvj day of Octobre, the ix day of this present Parlement; The Counseill of the right high, and mighty Prince, Richard Duc of York, brought into the Parlement chambre a Writeing, conteigning the cleyne and title of the right, that the seid Duc pretended unto the Coronas of Englonde, and of Fraunce, and Lordship of Ireland; and the same Writeing delivered to the right reverent fadre in God George Bishop of Excestre, Chauncellour of Englonde; desiring him, that the same writeing might be opened to the Lordes Spirituelx and Temporelx assembled in this present Parlement; And that the seid Duc myght have brief and expedient answer thereof: wheruppon the seid Chauncellour opened and shewed the seid desire to the Lordes Spirituelx and Temporelx; askyng the Question of theym, whether they wold, the said writeing shuld be openly radde before them or noo. To the which Question it was answered and agreed by all the seid Lordes, Inasmuch as every persone high and lowe, suying to this high Court of Parlement, must be herd, and his desire and peticion understand, that the seid writeing shuld be radde and herde, *not to be answered without the King's Commaundement,*

Rot. Parl.  
39 H. 6.  
n. 10.



maundement, for so much as the matter is so high, and of so grete myght and poyse; which writeing there than was radde; The tenour whereof followeth in these words: *It is not to be forgotten, &c.* as in Numb. 19. followeth.

n. 11.

n. 12.

And afterward the xxvij day of Octobre, the x day of this present Parlement, the seid Chauncellour shewed and declared to the seid Lordes Spirituelx and Temporelx, being in the same Parlement, how that the Counseill of the seid Duc of York gretly desired to have answer of such writeing, as upon the xvj day of Octobre last passed was put into this present Parlement, on the behalf of the seid Duc; and thereupon asked the seid Lordes, what they thought was to be doon in that matier. To the which Question it was answered, and thought by all the seid Lordes, *That the matier was so high, and of such wight, that it was not to eny of the King's Subgetts to enter into communication thereof, without his high commaundement, agreement, and assent had thereto.* And ferthermore, forasmuch as the seid Duc desired and required brief and undelaied answer of the seid wryteing, and in eschueing and avoyding of grete and manyfold inconveniences, that weren lykly to ensue, if hasty provision of good answer in that behalfe were not had; it was thought and agreed by all the Lordes, that they all shuld goe unto the King, to declare and open the seid matier unto his Highness, and to understand what his good Grace wold to be doon ferther therein. And theruppon incontinent all the seid Lordes Spirituelx and Temporelx went unto the King's high presence, and therunto opened and declared the seid matier by the mouth of his seid Chauncellour of England; and the seid matier by the King's Highness herd and conceyved, *It pleased him to pray and commaunde all the seid Lordes, that they shuld serche for to fynde, in as much as in them was, all such things as myght be objecte and laide ayenst the cleyne and title of the seid Duc.* And the seid Lordes besaught the King, that he wold remember him, yf he myght fynd eny resonable matier, that myght be objected ayenst the seid cleyne and title, in so moche as his seid Highness had seen and understonden many divers Writings and Chronicles; wheruppon on the morne, the xxviij day of Octobre, the xj day of this present Parlement, the foreseid Lordes sent for the King's Justices into the Parlement-chambre, to have their Avis and Counseill in this behalf; and there delivered



delivered to them the writeing of the cleyne of the seid Duc, and in the King's name gave them straitely in commaundement, sadly to take avysament therein, And to serche and find all such objections, as myght be leyde ayenst the same in fortifyng of the King's right.

Whereunto *the same Justices*, the *Monday*, the xx day of *Octobre* then next ensuing, for their aunswere upon the seid writeing to them delivered seiden, that they were the King's Justices, and have to determine such matiers as come before them in the Law; between partie and partie they may not be of Counseill: And sith this matier was betweene the King and the seid Duc of York as two parties, and also it hath not be accustomed to calle the Justices to Counseill in such matiers; *and in especiall the matier was so high, and touched the King's high Estate and Regalie, which is above the law, and passed their lerning, wherefore they durst not enter into eny communication thereof;* for it perteyned to the Lordes of the King's blode, and thapparage of this his lond, to have communication and medle in such matiers; And therefore they humble bysought all the Lordes, to have them *utterly excused* of any avyce or counseill by them to be yeven in that matier.

And then the seid Lordes, considering the aunswere of the seid *Juges*, and entending to have the avice and good counseill of all the King's Counseillours, sent for all the King's *Sergeants*, and *Attournay*, and gave theym straight commaundement in the King's name, *that they sadly and avisely shuld serche and seke all such things, as might be best and strengest to be allegged for the King's availe, in objection and desetyng of the seid title and cleyne of the seid Duc.*

Whereunto the seid *Sergeants* and *Attourney*, the *Wednesday* then next ensueing, answered and seiden, that the seid matier was put unto the King's *Justices*, and how the *Monday* last passed the same *Justices* seiden, and declared to the seid Lordes, that the seid matier was soo high, and of so great wight, that it passed ther lerning; and also they durst not enter eny communication in that matier, to yeve any avyce or counsaill therein: *And sith that the seid matier was so high, that it passed the lerning of the Justices, it must needs excede ther lerning; and also they durst not enter eny communication in that matier, and prayed*



and besought all the Lordes to have them excused of yevyng eny avyce or counsaill therein.

To whom it was aunswered, by the avys of all the Lordes, by the seid *Chaunceller*, that they myght not so be excused; for they were the King's perticuler Counsaillers, and therefore they had ther fees and wages: And as to that the seid *Sergeaunts* and *Attourney* seiden, that they were the King's Counsaillers in the Law, in such things as were under his auctorite, or by Commission; *but this matier was above his auctorite, wherein they myght not medle*, and humbly besought the seid Lordes to have them excused of yevyng eny counsaill in that matier: and it was aunswered them agayn, that the Lordes wuld not hold them excused, but let the King's Highness have knowleche what they said; and theruppon the seid *Chaunceller* remembred the Lordes Spirituelx and Temperelx of the seyings and excuses of the *Justices*, and seyings and excuses of the *Sergeaunts* and *Attourney*, and also the grete commaundement of the King's Highness, that they had, to find all such objections, as myght be moost mighty to defend the King's right and title, and to defete the title and cleyne of the seid Duc of York; And also that the King myght understond, that the seid Lordes diden their true and faithful devoure and acquitall in the seid matier, desired all the Lordes that every of them shuld sey what he cowed sey in fortifying the King's title, and in defeteing of the cleyne of the seid Duc: And than it was agreed by all the Lordes, that every Lorde shuld have his fredome to sey what he wold sey, without eny reporting or magre to be had for his seyng; And theruppon after the seiying of all the Lordes every after other, It was concluded, that thes matiers and articles, here undre writen, shuld be aleged and objecte ayenst the seid cleyne and title of the seid Duc.

Obiectio  
contra titu-  
lum præ-  
dictum.

1.

*First*, It is thought, that the Lordes of this Lond must needes call to their remembraunces, *the grete othes the which they have made to the King our Sovereigne Lorde*, the which may be leyde to the seid Duc of York; and that the Lordes may not breke thoo othes.

2.

*Item*, It is thought also, that it is to be called to remembraunce the grete and notable *Acts of Parlements*, made in divers Parlements of divers of the King's Progenitours, The which Acts be sufficient and resonable to be leyde againe the title of the seid Duc of York. The which



which Acts been of moche more auctorite than any Chronicle, And also of auctorite to defete eny manner of title be made to eny persone.

Item, It is thought, that there is to be leyd agayn the feid title *divers entaills made to the heires males*, as for the Corone of England, as it may appere by divers Cronicles and Parlements.

Item, It is thought, yf the feid Duc shuld make eny title or cleyme by the Lyne of Sir Leonell, that the same Duc shuld bere the Armes of the same Leonell, and not the Armes of Edmund Langley, late Duc of York.

Item, It is to be allegged agen the title of the feid Duc, that the time that King Herry the fourth toke upon him the Corone of England, he said he entred and toke upon him the Corone as right enheriter to King Herry the third, and not as a Conquerour.

To the which Articles the feid Duc of York gave his answeres in writeing as folowen.

Here under folowen the answeres of Richard Plantagenet, called commonly Duc of York, &c. to certain raisons and colours allegged, as it is feid, ayenst the matier of his right and title; &c.

Responsio-  
nes præfati  
Ducis ad  
Objectiones  
tituli sui  
prædicti.

n. 14.

First, Where it is feid, that it is thought, that the Lordes must nedes calle to their remembraunce the grete Othes which they have made to the King, which may be leid to the feid Duc, and that they may not breke thoo othes.

The feid Richard aunswereth and saith, that every man, under the peyne of everlasting dampnation, is bounde to obey to the lawe and commaundements of God, by the which lawe and commaundements trouth and justice owe to be preferred and observed, and untrouth and injustice laid apart and repressed: and soe it is, that of this bond, and duetye of obedyence to God's lawe, *noo man may discharge himself by his owne deede or act, promise or oath*; for elles of the contrary wold ensue *innumerable inconveniencies*; wherefore sith it is so, that the matier of the title and cleyme of the feid Richard Plantagenet is openly true, and lawful, and grounded upon evident trouth and justice; It followeth, that man shuld have rather consideration to trouth, right, and justice in this matier, accordingly with the will of the law of God, then to any promise or oath made by him to the contrarie, considered  
namely;



namely, that by the lawe and determination of holy Church an ooth made by oon persone unto the prejudice or hurt of an other, contrarie to trouth, justice, and charity, in the which standeth the plentitude and perfection of Godd's lawe, is void and of noon effect, neither in eny wise obligatory ; And that the vertue and nature of an ooth *is to confirm trouth, and in no wyse to impugn it ;* And over that *by the ooth of feaute, homage, or ligeaunce, no man is bounden to any inconvenient or unlawfull thing ;* And how be it that this answer is sufficient to all maner objections that may be made ayenst his cleyme and entent in this partie by reason or occasion of any ooth, yet natheless the seid *Richard*, for as much as the matier of othes is a matier spirituell, for more declaration of his conscience, honesty, and trouth in this partie, offreth himself redy to aunswer before eny Juge Spirituell, competent in place, and tyme covenable, to all maner of men, that eny thing woll purpose ayenst him in that behalf.

And to shew clerely, *that lawfully withouten offence of God and conscience he may cleyme and pursue his right, and desire Justice, in such fourme as he dooth, and that all other persones, and namely the Peers and Lordes of this Reame may, and by the law of God and man ought to helpe, and assist him in trouth and justice, notwithstanding any ooth of feaute, or other by him or them here before made.*

n. 15.

Over this, where it is thought also, that it is to be called to remembraunce the *grete and notable Acts of Parlement*, made in dyvers Parlements of dyvers of the King's progenitours, the which actes been sufficient to be levyed ayenst the title of the seid *Duc*, and of more auctorite then eny Cronicle, And also of auctorite to defete any maner title made to eny persone :

And also where 'tis said, that it is to be leyde ayenst the seide title dyvers entailles made to the heirs males, as for the *Corone of Englund*, as it may appear by dyvers Cronicles and Parlements :

The seid *Richard Plantagenet* aunswereth and saith, that in trouth ther been noo such actes and tailles made by eny Parlement herebefore, as it is surmysed ; *but only in the vijth year of King Herry the fourth a certeyne act and ordinaunce was made in a Parlement, by him called, wherein he made the Reaumes of Englund and Fraunce, amongs others,*

to



to be unto him, and to the heirs of his body comyng, and to his iiij sonnes, and the heires of their bodies comyng, in maner and forme as it appereth in the same act; And if he myght have obteigned and rejoyfed the seid Coronas, &c. by title of Inheritance, discent, or succession, he neither neded, nor wold have desired, or made them to be graunted to him in such wise, as they be by the seid acte, *The which taketh no place, nother is of eny force or effect ayenst him, that is right enheritor of the seid Coronas, as it accordeth with Godd's lawe, and all natural lawes; how it be that all othe actes and ordinaunces made in the seid Parlement, and sithen been good and sufficient ayenst all other persones.*

Item, Where it is thought, that if the seid Duc shuld make any title or cleyme by the line of Sir Leonell, he shuld bere the Armes of Edmund Langley late Duc of York: n. 16.

The seid Duc answereth, and saith, that trouth is, he myght lawfully have borne the Armes of the seid Sir Leonell here bifore, and also the same Armes that King Edward the third bare, that is to say, the Armes of the Reaumes of Englund and of Fraunce, but he absteyned of beryng of the seid Armes, *like as he absteyned for the tyme of purposyng, and pursuing of his right and title, &c. for causes not unknowen to all this Reaume; for though right for a time rest, and bee put to scilence, yet it roteth not, ner shall not perish.*

Item, Where it is alleged ayenst the title of the seid Duc, that the said Herry of Derby, at such tyme as he toke uppon him the Corone of Englund, seid, that he entred and toke the same Corone uppon him as right enheritour to King Herry the third, and not as a Conquerour: n. 17.

The seid Duc therto saith, that such saying of the seid King Herry the fourth may in noo wise be true, and that the contrarie therof, which is trouth, shall be largely ynough shewed, approved, and justefyed by sufficient auctorite, and matier of record: *And over that, that his seid saying was oonly to shadow, and colour fraudulently his seid unrightwyse, and violent usurpation, and by that moeyn to abuse deceyvably the people stonding about him.*

Item, The Saturday, the xvij day of this present Parlement, it was shewed unto the Lordes Spirituelx and Temporelx, being in this present Parlement, by the n. 18.  
c mouth



mouth of the seid *Chaunceller*, that the seid *Duc* of *York*, called besily, to have hasty and spedye aunswere of such matiers, as touched his title aboveseid; *And how that for as moche as it is thought by all the Lordes, that the title of the seid Duc cannot be defeted; and in eschewing of the grete inconvenients that may ensue, a meane was found to save the King's honour and astate, and to appease the seid Duc if he wold, which is this; That the King shall keep the Coronas, and his astate, and dignity roiall, duryng his lyfe, and the seid Duc, and his heirs, to succede him in the same; Exhorting and stering all the seid Lordes, that if eny of them cowde finde eny other or better meane, that it might be shewed; whereuppon after sad and ripe communication in this matier had, it was concluded and agreed by all the seid Lordes, that sith it was soo, that the title of the seid Duc of York cannot be defeted, and in eschewing the grete inconvenients that myght ensue, to take the meane above-reherfed, The othes that the seid Lordes had made unto the King's Highness at Coventre, and other places saved, and their consciences therein clered: And over that it was agreed by the seid Lordes, that the seid meane shuld be opened and declared to the King's Highness: And forthwith they went towards the King, where he was in his Chambre, within his Palice of *Westminster*; and in their goyng out of the Parlement-Chambre, the seid *Chaunceller* asked of the seid Lordes, that sith it was soo, that the seid meane shuld be opened by his mouth to the King's good Grace, yf they wold abide by him howsoever that the King toke the matier, and all they aunswered and said, Yee.*

All these premisses thus shewed and opened to the King's Highness, he, inspired with the Grace of the Holy Gooft, and in eschuyng of effusion of Christien blode, by goode and sad deliveration, and avyce had with all his Lordes Spirituelx and Temporelx, condescended to acord to be made betweene him, and the seid *Duc*, and to be auctORIZED by thauctoryte of this present Parlement: The tenour of which accord hereafter ensueth in maner and forme following.

Blessed be *Jesu*, in whos hand and bountie restith, and is the peas and unitee betwixt Princes, and the wele of every Reaume; thurgh whos direction agreed it is, appointed, and accorded as followeth; Betwixt the moost mighty



mighty Prynce, King *Herry* the sext, King of *Englond*, and of *Fraunce*, and Lorde of *Irelond*, on that oon partie, and the right high, and mighty Prince, *Richard Plantagenet*, Duc of *York*, on that other partie, upon certaine matiers of variaunce moeved betwixt them, and in especiall upon the cleyme and title unto the *Corones* of *Englond*, and of *Fraunce*, and roiall power, estate, and dignite apperteigning to the same, and Lordship of *Irelond*, opened, shewed, and declared by the seid Duc afore all the Lordes Spirituelx and Temperelx, being in this present Parlement, *The seid agreement, appointment, and accord to be auctorised by the same Parlement.*

First, Where the seid *Richard Duc of York* hath declared, and opened as above, his seid title and cleyme in manere as followeth; That the right noble, and worthy Prince, *Herry*, King of *Englond*, the third, had issue, and leefully gate *Edward* his first begoten Sonne, born at *Westminster*, the xv Kalends of *Juyll*, in the *Vigill* of *St. Marc* and *Mercellian*, the yere of our Lorde MCCXXXIX. and *Edmund* his secund Sonne, which was borne on *St. Marcell* day, the yere of our Lorde MCCXLV. The which *Edward*, after the deth of the seid King *Herry* his Fader, entituled and called King *Edward* the first, had Issue *Edward* his first begotten Son, entituled and called, after the decesse of the seid first *Edward* his fader, King *Edward* the secund; which had Issue, and leefully gate the right noble, and honourable Prynce, *Edward* the third, the true and undoubted King of *Englond*, and of *Fraunce*, and Lorde of *Irelond*; which *Edward* the third, true and undoubted King of *Englond*, and of *Fraunce*, and Lorde of *Irelond*, had Issue and leefully gate *Edward* his first begoten Sonne, *Prince of Wales*, *William Hatfeld* secund begoten, *Leonell* third begoten Duc of *Clarence*, *John* of *Gaunt* fourth begoten Duc of *Lancaster*, *Edmund Langley* fift goten Duc of *York*, *Thomas Wodestoke* sixt goten Duc of *Glouc*, and *William Windfore* the seventh goten; The seid *Edward Prynce of Wales*, which dyed in the lyfe of the seid *Edward King*, had Issue and leefully gate *Richard*, the which succeeded the same *Edward King*, his Grauntfire, in roiall dignite, entituled and called King *Richard* the secund, and dyed without Issue. *William Hatfeld*, the secund goten Sonne of the seid *Edward King*, dyed without Issue. *Leonell*, the third goten Sonne

*This is the same verbatim with the Writing put into the Parlement, n. 11.*



Sonne of the same *Edward King, Duc of Clarence*, had Issue, and leefully gate *Phelippe* his only daughter and heir, which by the Sacrament of Matrimonie copled unto *Edmund Mortymer Erle of Marche*, had Issue, and leefully bore *Roger Mortymer Erle of Marche*, his sonne and heire; which *Roger Erle of Marche* had Issue, and leefully gate *Edmund Erle of Marche, Roger Mortymer, Anne*, and *Alianore*; which *Edmund, Roger*, and *Alianore*, dyed without Issue; and the seid *Anne* under the Sacrament of Matrimonie copled unto *Richard Erle of Cambridge*, the sonne of the seid *Edmund Langley*, the fift gotten sonne of the seid King *Edward*, as it is afore specified, had Issue, and leefully bare *Richard Plantagenet*, commonly called *Duc of York*: The seid *John of Gaunt*, the fourth gotten sonne of the seid King *Edward*, and the younger Brother of the seid *Leonell*, had Issue, and leefully gate *Henry Erle of Derby*, which incontinent, after the time that the seid King *Richard* resigned the Coronas of the seid Reaumes, and the seid Lordship of *Ireland*, unrightwisely entred upon the same, then beyng on lyve *Edmund Mortymer Erle of Marche*, sonne to *Roger Mortymer Erle of Marche*, sonne and heir of the seid *Phelippe*, daughter and heir of the seid *Sir Leonell*, the third sonne of the seid King *Edward the third*; to the which *Edmund* the right and title of the seid Coronas and Lordship by lawe and custome belonged.

To the which *Richard Duc of York*, as sonne to *Anne*, daughter to *Roger Mortymer Erle of Marche*, sonne and heir to the seid *Phelippe*, daughter and heir to the seid *Leonell*, the third gotten sonne of the seid King *Edward the third*, the right, title, dignite roiall, and estate of the Coronas of the Reaumes of *Englond*, and of *Fraunce*, and of the Lordship and Lond of *Ireland*, of right, lawe, and custome apperteigneth, and belongeth, afore eny issue of the seid *John of Gaunt*, the fourth gotten sonne of the seid King *Edward*.

n. 20.

The seid title natheless notwithstanding, and without prejudice of the same, The seid *Richard Duc of York*, tenderly desireyng the wele, rest, and prosperite of this lond, and to set apart all that, that myght be trouble to the same, and considering the Possession of the seid King *Herry the sixt*, and that he hath for his time be named, taken, and reputed King of *Englond*, and of *Fraunce*, and Lorde of *Ireland*; is

content,



content, agreeth, and consenteth, that he be had, reputed, and taken, King of *Englond*, and of *Fraunce*, with the roiall estate, dignite, and pre-eminence belonging therto, and Lord of *Irelond*, duryng his lyfe naturall; and for that time the seid *Duc*, without hurt or prejudice of his seid right and title, shall take, worship, and honour him for his Sovereaine Lorde.

*Item*, It is accorded, appointed, and agreed, that the seid *Richard Duc* of *York* rejoyse, be entitled, called, and reputed, from hens forth verrey and rightfull heire to the *Corones*, roiall estate, dignite, and Lordship aboveseid; and after the deceffe of the seid King *Herry*, or when he woll ley from him the seid *Corones*, estate, dignite, and Lordship, the seid *Duc*, and his heires, shall immediately succeed to the seid *Corones*, roiall estate, dignite, and Lordship.

n. 22.

*Item*, For the more establisshing the seid accord; It is appointed, and consented, that the Lordes Spirituelx and Temporelx, being in this present Parlement, shall make oother to accepte, take, wurship, and repute the seid *Richard Duc* of *York*, and his seid heires, as above is reherced; and kepe, observe, and strengthen, in as much as apperteigneth unto them, all the things aboveseid, and resist to their power all them that wull presume the contrary, according to their estates and degrees.

n. 25.

The King understanding certainly the seid title of the seid *Richard Duc* of *York* just, lawful, true, and sufficient; by thavis and assent of the Lordes Spirituelx and Temporelx, and Commens in this present Parlement assembled, and by auctorite of the same Parlement, declareth, approveth, and ratifieth, confermeth, and accepteth the seid title just, good, lawfull, and true, and therunto yeveth his assent, and agreement; of his free will and libertie. And over that, by the seid avis and auctorite, declareth, entitleth, calleth, stablischeth, affermeth, and reputeth the seid *Richard Duc* of *York* verrey, true, and rightfull heire to the *Corones*, roiall estate, and dignite of the Reaumes of *Englond*, and of *Fraunce*, and of the Lordship of *Irelond* aforeseid; and that according to the wurship and reverence, that therto belongeth, he be taken, accepted, and reputed, in wurship and reverence, by all the States of the seid Reaume of *Englond*, and of all his Subgetts thereof, saving and ordeigning by

n. 27.



the same auctorite, the King to have the seid *Corones*, Reaumes, roiall estate, dignite, and pre-eminence of the same, and the seid Lordship of *Ireland*, duryng his lyfe naturall. And ferthermore, by the same avis and auctorite, wolle, consenteth, and agreeth, that after his decesse, or when it shall please his Highness to ley from him the seid *Corones*, estate, dignite, and Lordship, or therof cesseth; The seid *Richard Duc of York*, and his heires, shall ymmediately succeed him in the seid *Corones*, roiall estate, dignite, and Lordship, and them then have and joy, any *Act of Parlement*, *Statute*, *Ordynauce*, or other thing, to the contrarie made, or interruption, or discontinuance of possession notwithstanding. And moreover, by the seid avis and auctorite, stablisheth, graunteth, confermeth, approveth, ratifieth, and accepteth the seid accord, and all things therin conteyned; And thereunto freely and absolutely assenteth, and agreeth.

From this Record it is evident,

1. *Richard Duke of York* exhibited his bare Claim and Title to the Lords only.
  2. *Richard Duke of York* did not petition the Lords, n. 11.
  3. His Counsel only delivered in a Writing, containing his Descent and Title by *Birthright*, and *Hereditary Succession*, and nothing else.
  4. The Matter was so high, the Lords could not answer it, nor enter into Communication thereof, without the King's Command, Agreement, and Assent.
  5. The King consented, and prayed and commanded the Lords to search and find out what might be opposed to the Duke's Claim and Title.
  6. They sent for the Judges, to advise what might be said against the Duke, to fortify the King's Right.
  7. The Judges excused themselves, for that the Matter was so high, and touched the King's high Estate, and Regality, which was above the Law, and passed their Learning; wherefore they dare not enter into Communication thereof.
  8. The Lords, upon this Answer of the Judges, sent for the King's Serjeants and Attorney, and gave them the same Command; who made the same Excuse the Judges had done; but the Lords would not take it:
- Where-



Whereupon the Articles and Reasons against the Duke's Claim and Title were exhibited, *n.* 13.

9. That in the Articles and Reasons against the Duke's Claim and Title, there is not the least Word of *Philippa's* The Author, p. 22, 23. being illegitimate, or that her Father was divorc'd from her Mother; nor is there the least mention, that the House of *Lancaster* claimed by Prescription of sixty Years Possession, (which comes from *Doleman*) and the Author is to find out both these Things in the Parliament Rolls, or be guilty of downright Falshood; for he reports them both, as pleaded against the Duke's Title. As to the first, there needed no other Argument, if it had been insisted on, and could have been made good. And as to the second, neither was it insisted on, or mention'd, as was said before; and if it had, *Nullum tempus occurrit Regi*, would have been a sure Rule in this Case: For it is absurd to think, that Prescription, at least so short a Prescription as this, could justify a Wrong, and make a Title in this Case; for there is another Rule of Law, *Non confirmatur Tractatus temporis, quod de jure not subsistit*; no Length of Time makes that lawful, which was not so from the Beginning. If there be a Right Heir of the Crown, that claims, or else would claim, but that he wants either Notice of his Right and Title, or Power to make it good, or forbears to claim for other sufficient Vide n. 16. Reasons; here Prescription signifies nothing.

10. It was allowed, at least not contradicted, that *all Persons*, and namely the *Peers* and *Lords*, might, and by the Laws of God and Man ought *to help and assist him in Truth and Justice*, *n.* 14.

11. It was the Judgment of all the *Lords*, that the Title of the Duke, which was only Succession by Birth-right, and *Proximity of Blood*, could not be defeated.

12. That *Richard* Duke of *York* was by King *Henry*, and the *Lords*, acknowledged as very and rightful Heir to the Crown, and that he was so to be called.

13. That the Mean found out to save the King's Honour, and appease the Duke, *if he would*, was not, nor could be imposed or forced upon him; but he was at Liberty to accept or refuse it, and was no ways bound, but by his own Consent, *n.* 18.

14. The Oath that *Richard* Duke of *York* took, was in Pursuance of the Agreement; and any Man may lawfully take



take an Oath to make good a Bargain, where no Man receives Injury but himself; and so with his Consent that is injured, any other Person concerned in the Agreement, may swear to the Observation of it.

Page. 24.

Lastly, The *Weal*, *Rest*, and *Prosperity* of the *Land*, (which the Author calls the *Publick Good*) followed this Agreement; and the Reason was, that the Crown was restored to the Right Heir; whereupon all Murmuring, Hatred, Strife, and Contention amongst the People, and Evil-will and Contrivances against one another, ceased.

Ad p. 105.

### N U M B. III.

Fol. 165. *Registri Stillington B. & Wells Episcopi*, 1490.  
*Certificatio Mandati Domini Archiepiscopi Cant. pro declaratione & confirm. Tituli & Matrimonij Domini nostri Regis.*

OUR H. Fadre the Pope *Innocent VIII*, &c. by his proper Motion without Procurement of our Sovereign Lord the King, or of any other Person, for Conservation of the Universal Peace, and eschewing of Slanders, as should gendre the contrary of the same; understanding of the long and grievous Varyances, Dissensions, and Debates, that hath been in this Realm of *England*, bytween the House of the Dutchy of *Lancastre* of that one Part, and the House of the Dutchy of *York* on that other Part: Willing all such Divisions in Time following to put apart: By the Counsell and Consent of his College of Cardinals, approveth, confirmeth, and stablysheth the Matrimony and Conjunction made bytween our Sovereign Lord King *Henry VII.* of the House of *Lancastre* of that one Part, and the Noble Princeesse *Elizabeth* of the House of *York* of that other Part, with all the Issue lawfully born bytween the same. And in lykewise his Holinesse confirmeth, stablysheth, and approveth the Right and Title of the Crown of *England* of the said our Sovereign Lord *Henry VII.* and the Heirs of his Body lawfully begotten to him and them perteyning, as well by reason of his nighest and undoubted Title of Succession, as by the Right of his most Noble Victory, and by Election of the Lords Spirituall and Temporall,



rall, and other Noblys of this Realme, and by the Act, Ordonnance, and Authority of Parliament made by three States of the Lond. Furthermore he approveth, confirmeth, and declareth, that if it pleased God, that the said *Elizabeth*, the which God forbid, should decease without Issue, bytween our Sovereign Lord and Her of their Bodies born; that then such Issue as bytween him and her, whom after that God shall joyn him to, shall be had and born right Inheritours to the same Crown and Realme of *England*. Over this, the same our H. Fadre gevith his Blessing to all Princes, Noblys, and other Inhabitants of this Realme or outward, that aydeth and asfetteth the said our Sovereign Lord and his Heirs agenst his or ther Rebels, geving to them, that dye in his and ther Quarrell, full and plenary Pardon and Remission of their Sinnes.

## N U M B. I V.

Ad p. 161.

In Lord Chief Justice *Coke's* 4th *Inst.* c. 1. of the High Court of Parliament is the following Act.

**R**EX, &c. *Charissimis Consanguineis nostris nobilibus viris Joanni Militi, Henrico Clerico, Thomæ Domicello, ac dilectæ nobis nobili mulieri Joannæ Beaufort Domicellæ germanis præcharissimi avunculi nostri Joannis Ducis Lancastriæ natis Ligeis nostris salutem, &c.* Nos dicti Avunculi nostri Genitoris vestri precibus inclinati, vobiscum qui (ut asseritur) defectu natalium patimini, ut hujusmodi defectu (quem ejusque qualitatis quæcunque præsentibus habere volumus pro sufficienter expressis) non obstante, ad quascunque honoris dignitates (exceptâ dignitate Regali) præheminentias, status, gradus, & officia publica & privata, tam perpetua quàm temporalia, atque feudal. ac Nobil. quibuscunque nominibus nuncupantur, etiamsi Ducatus, Principat', Comitatus, Baroniam, vel alia feuda fuerint, etiamsi mediatè, vel immediatè, vel à nobis dependeant seu teneantur, præfici, promoveri, eligi, assumi, & admitti, illaque recipere, retinere perinde liberè & licitè valeatis, ac si de legitimo thoro nati existeretis, quibuscunque statutis seu consuetudinibus Regni nostri Angliæ in contrarium editis seu observatis (quæ hic habemus pro talitè expressis) nequaquam obstantibus; de plenitudine nostræ Regalis Potestatis, ac de assensu Parlamen<sup>t</sup>i nostri tenore præsentium dispensamus, vosque & vestrum quemlibet Natalibus restituimus & legitimamus.



*mamus. In cujus rei testimonium. Teste Rege apud Westm.  
9 die Feb. per ipsum Regem in Parlamento.*

Ad p. 173.

N U M B. V.

*A Letter from Q. Jane's Privy Council to the Sheriff, &c. of Kent.*

**A**FTER our hearty Commendations, &c. Whereas the Queen's Highnesse, Queen *Jane*, being presently by just Title in full Possession of the Imperiall Crown of this Realme, and other Dominions, and Preeminencies thereunto belonging; and the Lady *Mary*, Bastard-Daughter of the late King of famous Memory, King *Henry VIII*, doth not only by all the Waies and Means she may, stirre and provoke the Common People of this Realme to Rebellion, but also seeketh Means to bring in great Force of *Papists*, *Spanyards*, and other Strangers, for the Aid of her unjust and unnaturall Pretence, to the great Perill and Danger of the utter Subversion of God's Holy Word, and of the whole State of this Realme: Albeit wee nothing doubt, but these seditious and rebellious Doeings of the said Lady *Mary*, being well known unto you, will of themselves admonish you of your Duties to your, and our said Sovereigne Lady Queen *Jane*, and the Preservation of the true Religion, and antient Liberty of your naturall Country against Forreign Powers; yet considering, what Desolation may come to Men of Worship, and good Degree, and Wealth, by the Rebellion of the baser sort; we have thought good to signify unto you, that our said Sovereigne Lady Queen *Jane's* Pleasure and Commandment is, that you shall not only use all manner of Travel and Labour to keep and preserve her Majesty's People, inhabiting nigh about you, in Peace and good Quiet, and to repress all others, that shall goe about to move any Tumult, either by the Pretence of the unjust and fayned Title of the Lady *Mary*, being Illegitimate and Bastard, as is aforesaid, or by any other means; but also to put yourselves in order, with such Numbers of Horsemen and Footmen, as you shall be able to make of your Servants and Tenants, and others under your Rules and Offices; so as you may upon sending for, or other knowledge given you, either repayre to our very good Lord, the Duke of *Northumberland*, who having with him a very good Lord the Marquis



quis of Northampton, the Erle of Huntington, and other Personages of Estate, is presently in the Field with our said Sovereign's Power, for the Repression of the said Rebellions: Or otherwise be employed for the Defence of the Realme, as the Case shall require. By your good Travell herein, you shall not only declare yourselves good and faythfull Ministers to the Queen's Highnesse and your Countrey, but also well deserve to find her Highnesse your good and gracious Lady, in any your reasonable Suits, and us also most ready to further your said Suits accordingly. Thus fare ye right heartily well.

From the Towre att London the  
12th day of Julye, 1553.

Your assured Loving Frynds,

T. Cant. T. Ely Canc. Wynchester, Bedford, Suffulke, Arundel, Shrewsbury, Pembroke, Ryche, W. Petre, W. Cecyll, J. Cheek.

To our Loving Frynds the Sheriffe of Kent, the Justices of Peace of the same Shire, and to every of them.

N U M B. VI.

Ad p. 186i

Journal of the House of Lords, ann. ult. Hen. 8<sup>vi</sup>.

Memorand. **Q**UOD die Lunæ, viz. ultimo die Jan. Anno Regni Regis Hen. 8<sup>vi</sup> 38<sup>vo</sup> Dominus Cancellarius, confidentibus universis magnatibus, convocatis etiam Militibus, & Burgensibus à Domo communi, plenâ, viz. Curiâ, declaravit mortem Domini nostri Regis Hen. 8<sup>vi</sup>, qui obiit die Veneris ultimo præterito, cujus animæ propitiatur Deus. Quæ res dici non potest quàm erat luctuosa omnibus, & tristis auditu; Cancellarius verò ipse vix potuit prælachrymis ef-fari: tandem verò sedato fletu, & resectis animis omnium recordatione Principis Edwardi Divinâ indole imbuti, tum etiam lectione benè magnæ partis Testamenti dicti Domini nostri Regis defuncti, id quod factum est publicè per W<sup>m</sup> Paget militem, Primarium Secretarium dicti Domini Regis, sc. de successionem in Regno, de gubernandâ Repub. durante minore ætate jam dicti Domini Principis Edwardi, de solvendis debitis, de præstandis promissis, &c. D. Cancellarius declaravit, per mortem dicti Domini Regis dissolutum esse hoc Parliamentum, &c.

N U M B.



Ad p. 296.

NUMB. VII.

*A Declaration of the Succession of the Crowne Imperiall of England; made by J. Hales, 1563.*

**I**N so great and waighty a Matter as we have in hand, which concerneth the whole Realme universally, and every one of us particularly, I thinke I shall not neede to use any longe prohome to purchase your Favors to be content, or to move yow to be attentive to marke what shall be sayd. For as we few chosen of an infinite Multitude to treat and do these things, that shall be for the Benefit of the Commonweale, and be put in Trust for the Body of the Realme: So I trust Nature hath engrafted in us a desire to seeke those things, which may doe us good, and to avoyd the contrary: Wherefore not mindinge to use more Words then needs, nor fewer then me thinke the Greatnes of the Cause to require, I will directly proceed to the Matter.

The great and horrible Murders, and bloody Battayles, that were betweene the Factions of the Red Rose and the White, the Howse of *Torke* and *Lancaster*, for the Crowne of this Realme, by the happy Mariage of Kinge *H.* the vijth, and Queene *Elizabeth* his Wife, were ended; whereby great Quietnes and Peace (thanks be unto God) hath followed in this Realme, God graunt it may so continew.

This Kinge *H.* the vij and Queene *Elizabeth* had Issue, as yow know, Kinge *H.* the viijth, the Lady *Margaret*, and the Lady *Mary*. Kinge *H.* the viijth had Issue Kinge *Edward* the vijth, Queene *Mary*, and Queene *Elizabeth*, the Queene's Majesty that now is.

The Lady *Margaret* was first maryed to *James K.* of the *Scotts*, who had Issue *James* Kinge of *Scotts*, Father to *Mary* now Queene of *Scotts*. After his Death she maryed with the Erle of *Angwish*, and had Issue by him the Lady *Margaret*, now Countesse of *Lennox*.

The Lady *Mary*, the other Daughter of Kinge *Henry* the vijth, was first maryed to *Lewis* the French Kinge, and had no Issue of him. After she was maryed to *Charles* Duke of *Suffolke*, first secretly in *Fraunce*, and after-



afterward openly in *England*. The Duke and She had Issue the Lady *Frauncis*, and the Lady *Elia*nor.

The Lady *Frauncis* beinge eldest, was maryed to the Marques *Dorset*, by whom she had Issue the Lady *Catherine*, and the Lady *Mary*.

The Lady *Elia*nor was maryed to the Erle of *Comberland*, and had Issue the Lady *Margaret*, now Wife to the L. *Straunge*.

By the Statutes of Kinge *Henery* the viij, 28 and 35. the Crowne was intayled (as you know) for lacke of Issue of Kinge *Edward* to Q. *Mary*, and to the Q. Majesty that now is ; and for lacke of Issue of their two Bodyes, to such Person and Persons in remaynder, as shold please Kinge *Henery* the viij, and accordinge to such Estate, and after such Manner, Forme, Facion and Condition, as shold be expresse, declared, named, and lymited in his Highnes Letter Patents, or by his last Will in Writinge, signed with his Grace's hand. Stat. 28 H.  
8. & 35 H.8.

For the Establishment of which Succession we the Subjects of this Realme, besides our Promise by that Act declar'd, were also sworne by Othe, that we shold be obedient to such as Kinge *H.* accordinge to the sayd Estatutes, shold appoynt to succede the Crowne, and not to any other within this Realme, nor to any forreyne Authority, Power, or Potentate ; which Words do print well in your Myndes (I beseech yow.) Whereupon the sayd Kinge *H.* made his Will accordingly, in which he put the Heyres of the Lady *Frauncis* first, and next the Lady *Elia*nor in remaynder.

Others say, he caused a Will to be made, which was not accordinge to the Statute ; for that it was not signed with his Hand. Some say he made no Will at all.

The Question groweth, whether the Heyres of the *Scottish* Queene, or the Heyres of the Lady *Frauncis* and *Elia*nor be next Inheritors to the Crowne ; if it shold please God to take from us the Queene's Majesty without Heyres of her Body, or whether any of them be inheritable ; whereunto I declare my Minde and Judgement.

First, The Legacyes and Bequests, that Kinge *H.* made to diverse both of Lands and Monny, declare that he made a Will ; for all were performed and satisfied, I am enformed.



Also after his Decease, diverse Indentures tripartite were made betweene King *Edward* and the Executors of Kinge *H.* his Will, and others; and diverse Purchases and Patents passed under the Great Seale of *England*, in consideration of the Accomplishment and Performante of Kinge *H.* his Will.

*Thirdly*, Ther was a Will in the Name of K. *Henery* enrolled in the *Chauncery*, and diverse Constats therof made under the Great Seale, in which Will the Remaynder of the Crowne was in the Heyres of the Lady *Frauncis* first, and afterwards in the L. *Eliaior*.

*Finally*, Ther was a Clause in the same Will, that all other Wills made at any other Time, were Voyd and of none Effect; which needed not, if there had been none other Will; and that signed with his Hand.

All which be evident Arguments, that Kinge *H.* dyed not Intestat, but that he made a Will; and that it was the same Will, that was enrolled in the *Chauncery*; for it is not to be thought, that such Enrollement was done in vayne.

If the Will were made accordinge to the Statute; then it is without all doubt, that as we be bound, and have taken them for Kings and Queens by Name, that be expressed in the sayd Statuts, so we be bound to accept them, that be declared by the Will in Remaynder or Reversion; That is, the Heyres of the Lady *Frauncis*, and the Lady *Eliaior*; for they be expressed in the Will, and ought to have it by the like Authoritye and Title, as other expressed in the Statute; bycause it was in like manner done with the Consent of the whole Realme confirmed by Othes, which being not contrary to God's Lawes, nor the Law of Nature, and beinge in our Powers to observe and keepe, we ought not in any wise to alter or breake; for we know the Judgments of the Lord is certayne, *That he will not hold him guiltles that taketh his Name in vayne*: And so the Act and Will is a Barre and Exclusion to all others, be they never so near of Bloud, if any there be.

But some say, it is no Will made accordinge to the Statute; bycause it is not signed with the King's Hand, say they.

I pray yow consider well the Matter: If it shold now be doubted, whether it was his Hand; and that  
none



none shold be interpreted his Hand; but that was written with his owne Fingers; you shold admitt some of the Parlayments made by Kinge *H.* the Eyght; for the Statute made A° xxxiiij<sup>o</sup> of Kinge *H.* viijth, *ca.* xj<sup>o</sup>, Stat. 33 H. 8. cap. 11<sup>o</sup>. saythe, that the King's Royal Assent with his Letters Patents under his Great Seal, and signed with his Hand, and declared in the higher House to the Lords and Commons, is of such Force, as if he were present; accordinge to which Act diverse Assents at Parlayments were made, and in some of them some were attaynted of Treason, and suffered. Now if we shold doubt, whether it were his Hand or not, we mought perchaunce bringe such things in doubt, as we would not gladly come in doubt of; for we should put whole Parlayments in doubt.

But it may be sayd, sith by these Statutes that Power was given to King *H.* that he might make his Will of the Crowne, which otherwise by Law he cold not doe; Reason it is, he follow the Law prescribed; if he hath not done it, then it is voyd in Law; bycause *forma dat esse rei.*

To this I aunswer, that albeit it was not signed with his Hand, yet is it not a sufficient Cause, that we shold reject it; for if the Forme be so necessary to be observed; why, I beseech yow, do you allow Queene *Marye's* Parlayments, that were called by Writts, without the Addition of the Stile and Title of the Supreeme Head of the Church of *England*, &c. when there was a speciall Statute, and of the greatest Importaunce, before made of purpose to declare, that the Bishop of *Rome* had no Auſthority within this Realme; and chiefly upon this Cause, for that Kinge *H.* seinge his Daughter *Marye's* Stubbornes and Malice to his Doings, and fond Devotion to the Pope, ment, that if she shold at any Time come to the Place, she shold not, if she wold, undoe that he had done. And if yow will say, these Words of Supremacy needs not, albeit there were such a Statute; much lesse say I, these Words (with his Hand) need in this Case: For if you mark well the Consideration, why this Auſthority was given to Kinge *Henery* the viijth, for the Establishment of the Succession; yow shall find, it was to no other Ende, then the Statute of Kinge *H.* viijth in xxviij<sup>o</sup> declareth; that is, that Stat. 28 H. 8.  
after



after his Life the Realme shold not be destitute of a lawfull Governour, which ye see in this Will in this Part is fully performed; for by his Will he hath put first in Remaynder theyres of the Lady *Frauncis*, and then the Lady *Elleanor*; which beinge next of his Blood and Kinne, and such as he loved, and had no cause to hate, Nature did move, and Reason did teach, to preferre above all other.

Theyres of the *Scottish* Queene (ye know) he had no cause to love; for Kinge *James*, when he had promised to meete him at *Yorke*, mocked him; and afterwards made Warre agaynst him. And when the Lords of *Scotland* (after Kinge *James* his Death) had promised him the Mariadge of their Queene, they deceyved him, and maryed her to the Erle of *Angwishe*; which was not only without his Consent, but also unorderly and unlawfully done (as it is sayd.) And for the Words in the Statute (*the Will to be signed with his Hand*) is not of necessity; for that it was ment for the Succession; for he might have appoynted a Successor certayne without his Hand-Writinge; but for the more suerty, there shold be no counterfeyted Will in his Name, which cannot be presupposed of this Will, when these be named in Remaynder, which of Nature and Right ought to be preferred therunto. Shall we then with cavelinge Words subvert the State, when by the true Meaninge of the Statute, and without Injury to any, we may preserve our Country in Safety? Surely in my Judgement ther is no Reason, Equity, or Conscience, that can lead us so to doe: But, say they, it is not his Will signed with his Hand as the Statute requireth. How prove they that? Eyther it must be disproved by a sufficient Number of Witnesse, such as I take, bothe the Law Civill and Canon doth allow; for by what Law it was made, by that Law it must needs be disproved: Or else by comparinge the Hand and Signe, the Particle is signed, with other Writings that were signed with his own Hand; But such Conference cannot be, bycause the Original cannot be found: And to say the very truethe, after the Will was once proved and allowed, (which I take to be sufficiently done) when it was enrolled in the *Chancery*, and published under the Great Seale of *England*, by Kinge *Edward* the vith, being the Supreme Head in Earth



Earth of the Church of *England*, and so a sufficient Ordinary, the Particle needed not; for the Record was of more Strenght.

But, say they, there can be no such Record found in the Chauncery. Whether there be any such Record remaininge therof, or not, I know not; but sure I am, there was a Record thereof, and diverse Constats made of it under the Great Seale of *England*, for every of the Executors, and also for some others.

But I pray yow tell me, is it Reason, bycause the Originall, nor any Record therof appeareth, the Right of those that be in Remaynder shold be lost? Do Men loose their Inheritaunce, if by Chaunce of Fire or otherwise their Evidence be lost? And did Sir *Richard Sackvill*, Sir *John Mason*, Sir *Henery Nevell*, or theyres of Sir *Philip Hobby*, lose the Right to the Bishop of *Winchester's* Lands, bycause the Record thereof was destroyed? I trow yow will deny it; bycause the last Parlayment yow did orderly restore them. And albeit there be no Record of K. *Henery* his Will; yet there is no doubt, but some of the Constats doe remayne, and also Coppyes therof: And the Memory therof is so fresh, that albeit all the Constats and Coppyes were destroyed, yet there be Men, that do remember, that there was such a Will, and that the Remaynder was declared to be in the Heyres of the Lady *Frauncis*; and the Lady *Eliaenor*.

But let us consider (I beseech yow) at what Time; and to what Purpose, and End, the Record of the Will was defaced and destroyed: It was done in Queene *Marye's* Time (as the common Report goeth) and it must needs be presumed, that such wise and learned Men, as then bare the Sway of the Realme, wold not doe it for nought.

Was it bycause Queene *Mary* wold not satisfy the Bequests and Legacyes therein mencioned? That cannot be; for all were largely payd and performed before her Time to the uttermost. Was it then bycause they wold not have the Masses and Obytes therin expressed continued? That cannot be thought, when she and those that did it, did put their chief Trust of Salvation in Masses and Obytes.

Was it bycause they tendered Kinge *H.* his Honour, that they wold not have it appeare, that his Will after



his Death, and his Doings in his Life-time, were contrary? How cold that be, when they labored by all the Wayes they cold, to undoe that which he had done; to deface and dishonor him in all Things; and as some thinke, burnt also his Bones?

Was it bycause there was any thinge in the Will, which might authorize the Executors to withstand in any thinge Queene *Marye's* Affections? None were so plyable to her Devotions as the Executors, and they that were named in the Will: Was it bycause they wold barre the Queene's Majesty that now is of the Crowne? That cold not be; for she claymeth it, not by Will, but by Statute.

Seinge then that none of these Causes, that I have told, served to maintayne their Doinges, for the Destruction of this Will; and that both the Originall, and the Record of the Will be destroyed; it must of Necessity be concluded, that it was done onely, for that they knew the Will to be lawfull, and saw no other way to deprive the Heyres of the Lady *Frauncis* of their Right to the Crowne; otherwise they had no Cause to conceale it; which Imagination of them, esteeming themselves so wise and so learned, shall be deadly.

Confideringe that *Will. Sommer* used not in his Madnes to doe any thinge, but he wold render a Reason or Color for it, wrong or right: And some so earnestly labored agaynst the Law and theyr Othes to dissolve the Act of Succession, that if they had knowen any Man, that cold justly have preferred their Purpose, and sayd, it was a Counterfayt Will, they wold have made him to doe it by Hooke or Crooke, eyther for Hope of Reward, or for Feare of Torture.

Wold not they (thinke yow) have done it by some Color of Law, or by Examination of Witneses? Shold it not have beene published in the Starre-Chamber, preached at *Poule's* Crosse, declared by Act of Parlayment, and proclaymed in every Quarter of the Realme? Yes, doubtles: Nothings shold have been omitted, that cold possibly have beene devised, whereby so manifest an Untruthe, so much of their Commoditie, might appear; but bycause they saw, they cold not do it justly, nor handle the matter so craftily, but that every Man wold perceyve theyr Doinges, and in some disclose theyr



theyr Juglins ; therefore by like, like politicke Men, they tooke an unorderly Meane, and destroyed the whole Record ; thinkinge therby no Witnes cold be found, and so no Truthe appeare: But is not this, trow yow, a very straunge thinge ?

What if it be sayd otherwise ; either it must be his Will signed with his Hand, or els it is no Will at all. It will be as easy to prove the one, as deny the other ; for it cannot be but a Will ; for there be xi Witnesses, Men very honest and substanciall, that with the Subscription of their Names do testify the same ; and upon that the Executors proved the Will, tooke upon them the Administration, and have in every Point fulfilled it. Surely it cannot be denied, but that the Witnesses were very honest Men, substanciall and worthy to be credyted.

But the selfe same Witnesses that say it was a Will, affirme in like manner, that it was signed with his owne Hand : For the Words of the Will be these ; *In Witness whereof we have signed it with our owne Hand, in our Pallayce at Westminster, the third Day of December, &c. beinge present and called to be Witnesses these Persons, that have written their Names hereunder, Jon. Gats, &c.* So as I can learne no Remedy, but eyther bothe must be graunted, or bothe denied ; that is, eyther it is no Will, or els it was signed with his owne Hand.

Agaynst any of these Testimonyes can none of these Witnesses come, except they will discredit themselves ; and if any of the Executors goe about to impugn this Foundation and Testimony of the Witnesses ; then shall he not onely destroy his chiefe Buildinge ; but also say now agaynst that he hath before most manifestly confessed, when he allowed it, and proved it to be enrolled, and put forthe under the Great Seale ; and so with his Doublenes shall make himselfe no meete Witnes.

Besids these two Kinds of Witnesses I cannot imagine any ; for some of the Executors, and those xi Witnesses were suche, as were continually waytinge on the King's Person. If any other will come forth, and say it was not his Hand, it is to be considered, how many, and what they be ; not one or two will serve the Purpose, but there must be many, and those *omni exceptione majores*. Yf they were privy or consentinge to thembezelling of the Particle, or Destruction of the Record, the Law will  
not



not admitt them for Witnesses; for it accountethe them *inter falsarios*, and so *infames*. But sith in this Will, which is called Kinge *H.* his Will, there is this Clause, *That all other Wills, made at any other time, shold be voyd*; it appeareth he had other Wills. If any Man will deny it, not onely the Words of the Will (which otherwise shold be in vayne) will playnely reprove him; but also there be yet livinge, that have seene the same, and how that some of them were interlyned by Kinge *H.* and some of them in all, or for the most part, written with his owne Hand.

But perhaps it will be doubted, whether there were any suche Succession limyted or set forthe in his Will; which methinks ought not; for it will appere by manifest Presumption. First it is not to be doubted, sith Kinge *H.* so long time before (like a prudent Prince) forsook the great Daunger, that the Realme might fall in, for the Uncertaynty of the Succession; and that he had procured Authority and Power by Parlayment to establish it; and that mindinge in his Dayes personally to invade *Fraunce*; but that like a Father of his Country, with good Advise and Deliberation he made his Will, and established the Succession.

*Secondly*, It must needs be, that in that Will, so made before his goinge over, the Limitation of Succession was in such Manner and Forme, as is declared in his last Will: For, as I sayd before, there was no Cause, that he shold beare any Affection to the *Scottishe* Queene, nor yet to the Lady *Lennox*; and havinge no Cause to be offended with his Sister the *French* Queene, nor her Children; that is to be judged, that he wold not leave it to any other before them, or not provide, it might come to them specially, when he had none other Kinsfolke of his owne Blood to leave it unto.

*Thirdly*, This Last Will can be no new Will devised and made in his Sicknes, but the Coppy of his former Will; for if it had bene a new Will, then devised, who cold thinke, that eyther himselfe wold, or that any durst to have moved him to have put therein so many things contrary to his Honor? And sith it seemethe to be before written of his owne Devise, and no Man durst move him to alter it in those Poynts, that were agaynst his Honor, muche lesse durst they themselves devise any new  
Suc-



Succession, or move him to alter it otherwise; then they found it, where they saw, it could be none otherwise naturally disposed; And therefore if it could be fully proved, that his Will, which was called Kinge *H.* his Will, was not signed with his owne Hand (as it will be a very hard matter to prove *negativum Factum*) yet can it not be denied, but some of thother Wills, out of the which this Will was copyed, was written and signed with his owne Hand, or at the least enterlyned, which may be sayd a sufficient Signinge with his owne Hand; albeit perhaps the very Originall can not be brought forth.

Sith then it appeareth, that Kinge *H.* made a Will; sith it appeareth by the Testimony and Subscription of the xj Witnesse, that it was signed with his owne Hand; sith it was so præferred by the Executors; sith it was as his Will enrolled in the *Chauncery*, and published under the Great Seale of *England*, wherein it was written, that it was signed with his owne Hand; sith the Particle, and the Record therof be without Order destroyed, and all the other Wills burnt; and sith there can come forth no suche Witness to disprove it, as the Law admitteth; methinketh there is no Reason nor Color to move us to thinke, that this was not Kinge *H.* his Will, made accordinge to the Statute; nor yet that Men should thinke, that he made no Will; but rather to pronounce and confesse, that he made a Will accordinge to the Statute; and that which was called his Will, is the very true and right Will; and that by the Statutes, and by our Othes we are bound to receive them for Kings and Queenes of this Realme, if it should please God to take the Queene's Majestie from us without Issue.

But lett us admit an Untruth, that there was no Will; to the Ende there may be nothinge imagined, that cannot justly be aunswered; and that the Trueth (which for my parte I only desire) may appeare to all Men: Who then is right Heyre to the Crowne? It will be sayd, the *Scottishe* Quene; bycause she comethe of the eldest Sister, and is next of Blood to Kinge *H.* the viijth, accordinge to the Maxime of the Law.

True it is, there is such a Maxime in the Law; but it may not so largely be taken; for it must be restrayned to such, as be inheritable by the Laws of this Realme, which be borne within the King's Allegiance: For if



28 E. 3.

yow will put Straungers and right *Englishe* Men in one Case; What awayleth the Liberty of *Ingland*? What profiteth it to be an *Englishe* Man borne? For Straungers have not so great a Commodity in *Ingland* in all things, as *Inglish* Men have; for they be not onely not bound to serve the Realme, with their Witts; to mayntayne that with their Goods, and deffend it with their Bodyes and Blood as we be; but also they may come when they will; tarry as long as them listeth; and depart when it pleaseth them: Wherefore by Nature there ought to be great Difference betweene *Englishe* Men and Straungers; and that those onely shold enjoy the Sweete, that be bound to tast the Sower: And so our Lawes have provided, if we will suffer them to stand in Force: For the Statute of xxvij<sup>o</sup> E. Tertij; expoundinge the Law in this Case, sayeth, That the King's Children, whersoever they be borne, eyther within the Realme or without, be inheritable to their Auncestors: And that all others, which from that Time shall be borne out of the King's Allegyaunce, whose Fathers and Mothers at the Time of their Birthe be in the Faythe and Allegiaunce of the Kinge of *Ingland*, shold be in like manner inheritable to their Auncestors; whereby a Consequent may be gathered, (*a contrario sensu*) those that be borne of Father and Mother, that be not in the Faythe and Allegyaunce of the Kinge of *Ingland*, be not inheritable within this Realme. And so it appeareth (*Bracton*) that the Law before was; for he sayeth in the Title of Exceptions thus. *Sicut Anglicus non auditur implacitando aliquem pro terris & tenementis in Francia: Ita non debent alienigena & Francigena, qui sunt ad fidem regis Franciæ, audiri placitando in Anglia:* And in another place, *Lib. iij<sup>o</sup>. De exceptione dilatoria: Bracton* sayeth thus; *Item, Responderi, quod particeps, de quo dicitur, nil capere potest, quia est ad fidem Regis Franciæ, & ideo nil capere potest, antequam fiat:* And *Littleton* sayeth, as yow know, that in Actions Reall and Personall, by one borne out of the King's Allegyaunce, it is a good Plea for the Defendaunt to say, that the Playntife was borne out of the King's Allegyaunce.

But some say, that *Scotland* is a Member of the Crowne of *Ingland*, and therefore the People therin borne be in Allegiaunce of the Kinge of *Ingland*. Although *Scotland*

land



land of Right belongeth to the Crowne of *England*; yet is it not a sufficient Cause; that the People borne in *Scotland* be in the Kinge of *England*'s Allegyaunce. It cannot be denied, but that *Normandy* of Right belongeth to the Crowne of *England*; yet it followeth not therefore, that the *Normans* be in Allegiaunce of the Crowne and Kings of *England*. No; albeit that *Normandy* belongeth to the Crowne of *England*; yet bycause the People there did decline from their Faith and Allegyaunce; that they ought to the Kinge of *England*, and became subject, and gave their Faith and Allegiaunce to the *French* Kinge; their Lands were escheted, as appeareth by the Statute of *Prærogativa Regis*, cap. xij<sup>o</sup>. So in like manner, albeit *Scotland* belongeth of Right to the Crowne of *England*; and that the King of *Scotland* have oft-times done their Homage therefore to the Kings of *England*; yet we say, they have longe time forsaken their Faith and Alleigaunce of *England*, and have become Rebels; but rather have beene taken for Enemyes to *England*; for they have usually ransomed upon their Taking, as Enemyes, and not been executed with Deathe, like Rebels. And by that meanes Kinge *Jemy*, Father to their Queene that now is, was at the Time of her Birth, and of his Deathe, out of the Faythe and Allegiaunce of *England*. Wherefore to say, that she was borne within the King's Allegiaunce, because she was borne in *Scotland*, is a mere Cavillation, *secundum non causam ut causam*, more worthy to be laughed at, then to require any Answer at all.

Now let us compare these things together: You know, that the *Scottishe* Quene is not the Kinge of *England*'s Child; nor was borne in the Kinge of *England*'s Alleigaunce; nor yet come of Father and Mother in the Faythe and Alleigaunce of the Kinge of *England*; nor is a Free-Woman in *England*: Wherefore by the Lawes of *England* she can not inherite in this Realme. And if yow desire a Præident and Example for the very same Cause; that we now intreat of; yow may find it in the Chronicles; how *Margaret* the Daughter and Heyre of *Edward* the outlawed, Sonne and Heyre of *Ed. Ironside* Kinge of *England*, maryed to *Malcolyn* Kinge of *Scotts*, nor any of her Children never made any Clayme to the Crowne of *England*; but bothe her Husband;



band, and her three Children after him, and their Issue, beinge Kings of *Scotland*, did Homage to the Kinge of *England*.

But it will be sayd, that Kinge *H.* the Second was borne out of the King's Allegiaunce, his Father was no Denison, and yet he inherited the Crowne.

True it is, that he was borne out of the King's Allegiaunce: But whether he was made Free or not, that is uncertayne: Albeit it is to be supposed, that his Grandfather mindinge, that he shold succede him, omitted nothing that shold serve for that Purpose.

But this may we know by our Chronicles, that he came in rather by Election, and Consent of the Realme, then by Inheritaunce: For Kinge *H.* the First procured, that the Clergy and Nobility shold be twise sworne to the Succession of *Maud* the Empreffe, his Daughter, and her Heyres; and for breakinge that Othe, and receavinge Kinge *Stephan*, the History sheweth, that the Realme was marvaylously plagued, and especially the Clergy and Nobility; and that by Kinge *Stephan* himself: And besids, if we will wayghe the Matter indifferently, we may truly say, that Kinge *Henry* the Second enjoyed the Crowne by Inheritaunce lawfully: For albeit, that *Maud* were not Queene of *England de Facto*, yet she was *de Jure*. For *Stephan* was but an Usurper. And so Kinge *H.* the Second was the Queene's Child, which yow see by the Statute of *E. 3.* is free, whersoever they be borne.

And other Objection there is of *Richard* the Second, how he was borne at *Burdeaux* out of the Realme, and yet was Kinge. To that I aunswere, he had it justly; for he was borne of Father and Mother *Englishe*, in the King's Allegiaunce, which is sufficient, and also for Advantage; for *Burdeaux* was then in the Fayth and Allegiaunce of the Kinge of *England*.

Thus I take it very playne, that the *Scottishe* Queene can make justly, by the Lawes of *England*, no Clayme to the Crowne. Wherefore? bycause she hath no Right in Law, nor Reason.

And therefore now we will proceed to the Examination of the Title of the Lady *Lennox*; whom perchance some will thinke to have the next Right; bycause she

was



was Daughter of the Lady *Margaret*, the eldest Sister of Kinge *H.* the viijth.

True it is, she was her Daughter: But her Father, the Erle of *Angwishe*, was a *Scott*, an Alyen, and no Denizon.

But it will be sayd; it maketh no matter, what her Father was, so that she was borne in *England* (as it cannot be denyed she was;) for, as some say, the Law of *England* doth allow every Persone to be *Englishe*, that was borne in *England*, of what Nature soever his Parents be, if they were only *ad fidem Regis Angliæ*; that is, sworne to be true to the Kinge of *England*, and his Subjects, as the Earle of *Angwishe*, at the Birth of the Lady *Lennox* his Daughter, was not.

Perchaunce it might make somewhat to the Purpose, in the Opinion of the common People; albeit in very Deed, and by the Lawes of the Realme it seemeth nothing at all: For it appeareth in the 14 *E.* iij, and 14 *H.* vj, that albeit an Alien be sworne to be true to the Kinge and the Realme in any Lete of Succession, yet is he not abled therby to purchase Land; but must be enabled therunto expressely by the King's Letter Patents.

But that the Child shold inherite, and the Father not free in *England*, it cannot but seeme very straunge, how any such Opinion shold be conceaved of any Man learned; for it differeth from the Lawes and Pollicyes of all other Places. The Law sayeth, *Sequitur Patrem*; that is to say, the Child shall be accompted of that Nation, where his Father was borne. If the Father be *French*, whersoever the Child be borne, it shall be accompted *French*; if the Father be an *Italian*, the Child must be an *Italian*; if the Father be *Duche*, the Child shall be *Duche*; except his Father have forsaken his owne Native Country; and hath not onely given his Fayth to another Prince of Estate, but also is admitted to be a Citizen, or Freeman there.

And the Reason seemeth to be this; that sith Man is naturally disposed to live in some Socyety, (and indeede must needs so live, if he will be like to Man, and not wander Abroad like a Beast) he must joynn himselfe to some Society or Congregation, wherin as he desireth to enjoy the Benefits that grow of such civil Society; so it



is meete and reasonable, that he shold be Partaker of the Burdens, and faithfully to maintayne that Society and defend it, by which he himselfe is præserted and maintayned. And bycause God first made Man, and of Man Woman; and hath also made him a more apter Instrument to serve in the Common Weale, in the Functions both of Body and Mind; therefore is Man præserted before the Woman, and thought the more worthy Person, not only by the Lawes of Nature, but also by all other Lawes, and also by the Lawes of this Realme, as appeareth 7 E. ij. And so the Children in all other Places follow the Condition and Estate of their Fathers, as the more worthy Person; which they do also here in *England*; for the Law in like manner sayethe, *partus sequitur Patrem*; which if it shold be expounded onely in Cases of the Bondman and his Wife, and that the Child shold be Bond or Free, accordinge to the Condition of the Father; then is it no Maxime, as the Law termeth it; for a Maxime is a Rule, that serveth to rule and decise more Matters and Cases then one.

But let us seeke, if we can find any Reason to maintayne this our Opinion, That every Person borne in *England*, of what Nation soever the Parents be, shall be free; for Positive Law written ther is none to maintayne it; except yow will take for Positive Law written, that which is conteyned in the Booke of the Exposition of the Formes of the Lawes of *England*, which of what Auðthoritye it is, I know not. But what sayeth the Booke? Veryly thus: Yf an Alien come and dwell in *England*, beinge none of the King's Enemyes, and there hath Issue, this Issue is not Alien, but *Inglish*.

But no such Alien was the Erle of *Angwishe*; for, as the Chronicle witnesseth, he cam not into *England*, with a mind to tarry and inhabite here, but after he had married the *Scottishe* Queene, both without Kinge *H.* her Brother's Assent, and also agaynst the whole Counsayle of *Scotland*, there fell such a Varyaunce betweene them and the Lords of *Scotland*, that she and the Earle, like banished Persons, fled into *England*, and wrote unto the Kinge for Mercy and Comfort in his great Distres. The Kinge enclined to Mercy, sent them Apparell, and all other Things necessary, willinge them to lye still in *Northumberland*, till they knew further of his Pleasure.

Wher-



Wherupon they continued and kept at *Harbottell*, where she was delivered of the sayd Lady *Lennox*; and after Kinge *H.* sent for her, and her Husband the Earle, to come to the Court, which they promised so to doe: But secretly the sayd Earle of *Angwishe* fled backe into *Scotland*, (belike to his other Wife, as yow shall hereafter heare) mistrusting, lest the Kinge had had Understandinge, how he had distayned and abused his Sister, and so she came without the Earle to the Court. Now when Kinge *H.* had hard, that the Earle of *Angwishe* was so departed, he beinge greatly therewith displeased, sayd it was done like a *Scott*; and so, after that the Queene had taryed one whole Yeare in *England*, she returned into *Scotland*; wherby it may appeare, that the sayd Earle of *Angwishe* is not of that Sort of Aliens, that the sayd Booke of the Exposition of the Termes of the Lawes of *England* speaketh of; for he cam not into *England* to dwell, nor had any Dwellinge place there; but rather was to be adjudged a Guest; or as a Bird that leaveth for a time her native Country, while the fowle Weather lasteth; or as a wild Beast, that is chased with Hounds out of his Haunt, and flyeth till he perceave they persecute him no longer. And so the Lady *Lennox* can clayme no Benefitt at all by this Law, (if it be taken for a Law) but rather it maketh altogether agaynst her. Moreover, Statute ther is none to mayntayne this Opinion, that sayeth, every Person is *Englishe*, that is borne in *England*, of whatsoever Nation his Parents be. Then of Necessity it must be by Custome, if it be not by Law, which having no Reason to mayntayne it; or if it be contrary to Reason, it is no Law, have it had never so long Continuance.

But this is rather a great Evill to be abolished, as the Lawes of this Realme do playnely teach us; for they say, Customs not grounded upon Reason, cannot prescribe. But you will say, the Reason is, to entise Straungers to come and inhabite the Realme. But what Intisement can that be, when they themselves by their Cominge shall not be made free, nor may purchase any Land to leave to their Posterity? And albeit that Reason mayntayneth this Custome, yet can it not serve the Lady *Lennox*: For her Father the Earle cam not into this Realme to inhabite and dwell in the same, as before is sufficiently declared. Perchaunce it will be sayd, that it is the Nature



ture of the Soyle, to make such as be borne in *England* free in *England*: But then how happeneth it, that this Property is private to *England*, and not common to all other Countreyes? Truly this is not allowed in any other Country, and not without good Reason: For Division of Kingdomes and States, Ordinaunces of Cityes and Common Weales, and the Libertyes and Franchises thereof, is not by Nature, but commeth of Consent of Men, and by Man's Law; and they receyved none to be free in their Common Weale, but such as eyther for their Fayth, their Parents being free, and Citizens borne thereunto, they do not suspect, but that they will walke in the Steppes of their Parents Fidelity; or els such, as upon great Consideration, and with Promise of their Fidelity and Allegiaunce, they do newly admit to be Citizens; of which Number younge *Baber* cannot be; for *Simplicitèr* the Magistrate can have no Respect of them; neyther be they meete, nor able to make any Promise of Band or Fidelity to the Common Weale; for as the Common Weale is bound to maintayne and preserve those that are free, from Injuries, Wrongs, and Injustice; even so doth it require of them Promise to be true therunto, to serve, helpe, and defend it to their uttermost Power.

And marke, I pray yow, into what Absurdity yow fall into, if this shold be admitted for Law, that every one borne in *England* shold be free in *England*, of whatsoever Nation his Parents were.

I ask this Question: If the Child of an Alien borne in *England*, be free in *England* by his Birth; and by Reason likewise, that his Father being a *Scott*, be free also in *Scotland*, (as doubtless by their Law he is, wherefoever he be borne) if Warres shold happen, as it hath many times done, betweene these two Realmes; whose Part shall this Child take?

No Man can serve two Masters at one time, (sayeth the right Law-Maker, and also common Reason) yf this Child so borne, as I have before sayd, follow the *Scottishe* Part, then is he a Traytor to *England*; and in like manner a Traytor to *Scotland*, if he take Part with *England*: But if he will take Part with neyther of them, then he is a Traytor to both of them.

For



For every Man by the Law of Nature, which is God's Law, and by the Lawes of each Realme, is bound to declare himselfe a Member to one Commonwealthe, or other, (that is) to bestow Life and Goods therof when neede requireth; therefore I aske, which Part it is like he will take, that is thus a Mongrill of two Nations. Truly, in my Judgment, there is no Reason, eyther to move *England*, or *Scotland*, to thinke, that such a Person can be true to any of them both; for it hath beene a Principle receyved of all Men, as long as Citizens and Estates of Commonweales have beene, that no Man can be a Citizen of two Cytyes, or a good Member of two Commonweales; bycause he can not serve them both at once. Wherefore I can not see, that this Proposition (that every Person borne in *England*, of what Nation soever his Parents were, shold be free in *England*) can be justified by any Reason; and therefore the Lady *Lennox* can take no Benefitt therby.

But admit the Law of the Realme were certayne, that all Children borne within the Realme, shold be free of whatsoever Nation the Parents were; yet if it be true that is reported, the Lady *Lennox* is clerely excluded by the Law of the Realme, to be Heyre to any Person of any Possession within this Realme: for it is said, that at that time, when her Father the Earle of *Angwishe* was maryed to the *Scottishe* Queene, her Mother, he had another Wife livinge; wherefore there was a Divorse sued betweene him and the *Scottishe* Queene; and after the same Divorse, the *Scottishe* Queene (in the Life of the Earle of *Angwishe*, the sayd Lady *Lennox* Father) maryed the L. of *Muffin*, with whom she continewd all her Life longe as Man and Wife.

But it may be sayd, that that Divorse can not disable the Lady *Lennox* to be Inheritor to her Mother the *Scottishe* Queene; for albeit he had another Wife livinge at that Time, that he maryed the *Scottishe* Queene; yet forasmuch as she was ignorant therof, and maryed him (*bonâ fide*) the Child borne of them is by the Common Law lawfull. True it is, that by the Common Law she is Legitimate; but the Lawes under which we be borne, and by the which we must be judged, and wherby also the Cases of Inheritance be and must be ruled, do not al-



low her for Legitimate, as they do not likewise others in other Cases.

The Cannon Law sayeth, If a Man have begotten a Child of a Woman unmarried, and after the Birth of the Child do marry her, the Child shall be accounted legitimate, as if it had beene borne in lawful Matrimony: But the Lawes of *England* be, and alwayes have beene contrary, that it shall not be counted legitimate. Albeit great Suite have beene made to the contrary, to make the Lawes of the Realme to agree with the Cannon Lawes in this Poynt, as appeareth by the Statute of *Merton*, cap. ix.

So albeit the Cannon Law alloweth the Child borne in the second Mariage, the first not being dissolved, to be lawfull, if any of the Parents thinke the Mariadge good; yet do not the Lawes of the Realme allow the same: But bycause the first Mariadge was never lawfully dissolved, and that one Man can have but one Wife at once, it accompteth the second Mariadge voyd; and the Child born therein is accompted a Bastard, and not inheritable within this Realme; as appeareth by *Glanvile*, *Bracton*, and *Britton*, and all the whole Course of the Lawes received, and used, from the Beginninge unto this present Time; wherfore the Lady *Lennox* can extend justly no Manner of Title to the Crowne of *England*. So it may appeare by the Lawes of this Realme, that neyther the *Scottishe* Queene, nor yet the Lady *Lennox* have any manner of Title to the Crowne of *England*, be they never so neare of Blood; the one, bycause she is not the King's Child, nor free in *England*; the other, bycause (if she were free) the Lawes do not allow her legitimate, and inheritable in this Realme,

And therefore as to the next of Blood, and true and just Heyre by our Lawes, the Crowne ought to discend to the Heyres of the *French* Queene, which be the Daughters of the Lady *Frauncis*, and the Lady *Eliaenor*, and præsently to the Lady *Catherine*, beinge eldest Daughter of the eldest Sister the Lady *Frauncis*. Agaynst these Heyres of the *French* Queene, these are objected: They say, these cannot inherit; why so?

Bycause they were not lawfully borne; for *Charles* Duke of *Suffolk* had at that Time he maryed the *French* Queene,



Queene, another Wife livinge, that is, the Lady *Mortymer*.

To this I aunswere, that albeit it were true, that the Lady *Frauncis* and the Lady *Elleanor* were not lawfully borne, as it is not true, (as yow shall heare hereafter) yet it hurteth not the Title of their Heyres, given by Kinge *Henry* his Will; for it is appoynted to the Heyres of them, and not to themselves, as the Will playnly declareth.

But verily this is a mere Slaunder, growen altogether upon Malice, and no Accusation made upon any just Præsumption; for I beseech yow tell me, is it like, or can any reasonable Man thinke, that if Duke *Charles* had had another Wife livinge, when he maryed the *French* Queene, that Kinge *H.* wold have consented, that his Sister shold have receaved so great Injury, that she shold have bene kept like a Concubine? Wold his Counsaile have suffered so great an Infamy to have come to his Majesty's Stocke? Or wold the Nobility of the Realme, with such Triumphe, have honored so unlawfull an Acte? Wold the common People, who many times be ready to speak Evil of Well-doinge, have holden their Touns in so manifest Adultery? Is it like, that in so long time, that the *French* Queene and the Duke lived together, as Man and Wife, (that was all the Life of the *French* Queene) that she shold not have heard of it?

Was it possible, that amongst so many Women, which dayly resorted to her (whose Nature yow know is to seeke for all such Things, be they never so secret, and to communicate them to others) that none wold have told her of it? Or is it to be believed, that she, contrary to the Nature of all other Women, wold have bene contented, that another shold have bene Partaker of that Flesh, which she, according to God's Word, tooke only to be her owne? Or can any Man thinke, that any Woman can be contented to live in meane Degree, when she may be a Duches, as the Lady *Mortymer* might have bene justly, if she had bene the Duke's Wife? Surely there is no Reason to make any Man to thinke so; then muche lesse to report so. But suppose, that the Duke had had another Wife livinge, at the Time he maryed the *French* Queene; yet for as much as he



he and she were maryed together openly, contynued all their Lives as Man and Wife together, and nothings sayd agaynst them, and every Man tooke them for Man and Wife; and that the Lady *Frauncis*, and the Lady *Elia*nor were not taken to be Bastards duringe their Lives: Now, after their Death, neyther they, nor their Children may, by the Lawes of this Realme, be accounted foe. *Nec justum est aliquando mortuum facere Bastardum, qui toto tempore suo tenebatur pro legitimo*, as appeareth by a Judgement given at *Westminster*, in the xiiij E. 3.

But for the Declaration of the Trueth of this Matter, and to put out of the Heades of the People this fond Opinion and Talke, which is onely moved of Malice, and commeth not of any certayne Knowledge, and encreased by light Creditt without Consideration, and maintayned by such, as no doubt passe so much upon the Trueth, as desirous to satisfy their froward Affections.

Yow shall understand, that the Duke of *Suffolke*, *Charles Brandon*, beinge in the Court, livinge sole and unmarried, made a Contract of Matrimony with one Mrs. *Anne Browne*; but before any Solempnization of Mariadge, not onely had a Daughter by her (which after was maryed to the Lord *Powes*) but also brooke Promise with her, and openly and solemply maryed with the Lady *Mortymer*; which Maryadge the sayd Mrs. *Anne Browne*, judicially accused to be unlawfull; for that the sayd Sir *Charles Brandon* had not onely made a pracontracte with her, but also had carnally knowen her; which Things beinge duly proved, and Sentence of Divorse betweene the sayd Sir *Charles* and the Lady *Mortymer* given and denounced; he maryed solemply the sayd Mrs. *Anne Browne*, at the which Maryadge all the Nobility were praesent, and did honor it. And afterwards the sayd Sir *Charles* had by the said Mrs. *Anne Browne* another Daughter, which was maryed to the L. *Mounteagle*.

After this the sayd Mrs. *Anne Browne* continewed with him all her Life as his Wife, and dyed his Wife, without any Impechement of the Mariadge: After whose Death Kinge *Henry*, having him in great Favor, intended he shold for his better Praeferrment have married



ried the Lady *Lisle*, beinge a younge Mayd, and an Inheritor; whereupon the sayd Sir *Charles* was created Viscount *Lisle*. But that Mariadge by reason of her Youth took no Place. After this he was created Duke of *Sussex*, about which Time *Lewis* the *French* Kinge dyed: And leavinge the sayd Lady *Mary* (Daughter to Kinge *H.* the vijth) Widdow; the sayd *Charles* Duke of *Sussex* was sent into *Fraunce* for her; and with the Consent of Kinge *H.* maryed her twise; first secretly in *Fraunce*; and after openly here in *England* (as before is declared) and so they lived together all their Lives longe, as Man and Wife; and were so accepted and taken of all Parts, and no Persons impugninge or gaynsayeinge of the same: For there was no just Cause. After this they had Issue betweene them, that is the Lady *Frauncis*; and the Lady *Elianor*.

Agaynst whom the Lady *Powes*, their base Sister, in the Time of Kinge *Ed.* vijth, alledgyd Bastardy. But yet notwithstanding that, they were both by the Lawes of the Realme, and by the Cannon Lawes, declared to be legitimate, and approved to be borne in lawfull Matrimony; so as no Man can say they be Bastards. And if that they cold, yet at this present, bycause it was adjudged for them, that it was not soe; and also, for that they both be dead, and dyed taken as Legitimate, he ought not to be hard by Order of any Law in the World, if he wold object it agaynst them. But havinge no Occasion or Similitude of Truthe in the Spewing out of this their malicious Stomachs, is rather to be reprov'd as a Slaunderer, and as a sedicious Person goinge about to sow Sedition and Discord in the Commonweale, to be punished even as one, which seeketh by all meanes to move Civill Warres in this Realme, and to bringe it to Destruction; and therefore as a Traytor to be taken to the Realme, and even as one purposinge to subvert the good Providence of Almighty God, as God's Enemy to be adjudged, taken, and used.

Thus have I declared unto yow my Judgement touching the right Heyres to the Crowne of *England* in Remainder and Reversion; which is, as I take it, presently the Lady *Catherine*, Daughter to the Lady *Frauncis*, both by Kinge *H.* his Will, and also by the Common Lawes of this Realme; and that we be bound both by our Othes and also by our Lawes so to take her.



But if we shall for any Affection take away the Right from those, that have the Right, and which justly ought so to have; then let us remember this Sayinge and perillous Threatninge of the Holy Ghost; *Propter injusticias & injurias, transferretur regnum à gente in gentem.*

And thus simply have I put this Question and Doubt in Writinge, to the ende it may the better and more perfectly be aunswered: And if any Man will take the Paynes to do it, I require it may be done in Writinge; so shall it quickly come to an Issue; and if he can confound by just Argument that, which I have before alleadged, he shall both satisfye my Expectation, and also finde me ready to say as he sayeth. But if he cannot, then I require him for God's sake, and for the Love of his Country, to give Place to the Trueth quietly.

## D I X I.

Ad p. 206.

## NUMB. VIII.

30 Decemb.  
1546.

38 H. 8.

*A Copy of Henry VIII.'s Will, taken from the Exemplification, that was enrolled in Chancery, and is since lost; which being more Correet than that printed in Fuller's Church History, was thought proper to be lay'd before the Reader, for his better Information in the Controversy there-to relating.*

*Irroꝝ in Dorſ' Claus' Cancellar' Dñi nri Regis Edwardi Sexti de Anno Regni sui Primo.*

*Henry R.*

**I**N the Name of God, and of the Glorious and Blessed Virgin our Lady Sainct *Mary*, and of all the Holy Company of Heaven.

We *Henry* by the Grace of God King of *England, Fraunce and Irland*e, Defender of the Faith, and in Erth ymediately under God the supreme Hed of the Church of *England and Irland*e of that Name Theight, calling

\*

es, &amp;c.

to our Remembraunce the great Gifts and Benefits of Almighty God given unto us in this Transitory Lief, give unto Him our most lowly and humble Thanks, knowledging ourself insufficient in any part to deserve

or



or recompence the same. But feare that we have not worthely received the same.

And considering further also with ourself, that we be, as all Mankind is, mortal and born in Sinne, believing nevertheless, and hoping that every Christien Creature lyving here in this transitory and wretched Woorld under God, dying in stedfast and perfect Faith, endeavoring and exercising himself to execute in his Lief Tyme, if he have Leasur, such good Dedes and charitable Works, as Scripture commandeth, and as may be to the Honour and Pleaseur of God, is ordeyned by Christe Passion to be saved, and to atteyn Eternall Lief; of which Nombre we verily trust by his Grace to be oon.

\*  
ur &c.  
an cur.

And that every Creature, the more high that he is in Estate, Honor, and Authorite in this Woorld, the more he is bounde to love, serve, and thank God, and the more diligently to endeavour himself to do good and charitable Works to the Lawde, Honour, and Praise of Almighty God, and the Profit of his Sowle.

We also calling to our Remembrance the Dignite, Estate, Honour, Rule, and Gouvernance, that Almighty God hath called us unto in this Woorld, and that neither We, nor any other Creature mortall knowith the Tyme, Place, whenne, ne where it shall pleas Almighty God to call him out of this transitory Woorld. Willing threfore and minding with Gods Grace before our Passage out of the same, to dispose and ordre our latter Mynd, Will, and Testament in that sort, as we trust it shall be acceptable to Almighty God our only Savyour *Jesus Christ*, and all the hole Company of Heaven, and the due Satesfaction of all godly Brethren in Erth. Have therefore, now being of hole and perfect Mynde, adhering holy to the right Faith of *Christ* and his Doctrine, repenting also our old and detestable Lief, and being in perfect Will and Mynd by his Grace never to return to the same, nor such like; and minding by Gods Grace never to vary therefro as long as any Remembraunce, Breth, or inward Knowledge doth, or may remayn within this mortall Body, moost humbly and hartly do commend and bequeyeth our Soull to Almighty God, who in Personne of the Sonne redeamed the same with his moost precious Body and Blood in Tyme of his Passion. And for our better Remembraunce thereof,



thereof, hath left here with us in his Church Militant, the Consecration and Administration of his precious Body and Blood, to our no little Consolation and Comfort, if we as thankfully accept the same, as he lovingly, and undeserved on Man's behalf, hath ordeyned it for our only Benefit, and not his. Also we do instantly requyre and desire the Blessed Virgin *Mary* his Mother, with all the Holy Company of Heaven, continually to Pray for us, and with us, whiles we lyve in this Woorld, and in the Tyme of passing out of the same, that we may the sooner atteyn Everlasting Lief after our Departure out of this transitory Lief, which we do both hope and clayme by *Christs* Passion and Woord. And as for my Body, which whenne the Soul is departed, shall thenne remayn but as a Cadaver, and so return to the vile Matter it was made of; wer it not for the Rowme and Dignitye, which God hath called us unto; and that we wouold not be noted an Infringer of honest worldly Policies and Custumes, whenne they be not contrary to Gode Lawes; We wouold be content to have it buried in any Place for Christien Folke, were it never so vile; for it is but Ashes, and to Ashes it shall again. Nevertheles, bicaus we wouold be lothe in the Reputation of the People, to do Injurye to the Dignite, which we unworthily are calid unto:

We are content, and also by these Presentes our last Will and Testament do Will and Ordeyn, that our Body be buried and enterred in the Quere of our College of *Windefour*, Midway between the *Statte* and the high *Auttare*, and there to be made and sette, assone as conveniently may be doon after our Deceasse, by our Executours, at our Coste and Charge, if it be not done by us in our Life-time, an honorable Tombe for our Bones to rest in, which is well onward, and almoost made therefor alredye, with a fayre Grate about it; in which we will also, that the Bones and Body of our true and loving Wief Queene *Jane* be put also; and that there be provided, ordeyned, made, and sett, at the Coste and Charge of us, or of our Executours, if it be not done in our Life, a convenient Aulter, honorably prepared, and apparailled with all Maner of Thinges requisite and necessary for Dayly Masses, there to be sayd perpetuelly, while the Woorld shal endure.

Also



Also we will, that the Tombes and Aultars of King *Henry* the vijth, and also of King *Edward* the ivth our Great Uncle and Graunt-Father, be made more Princely, in the same Place where they now be, at our Charge.

And also will and specially desyre and requyre, that where and whensoever it shall pleas God to call us out of this World Transitory to his Infinite Mercy and Grace, be it beyonde the See, or in any other Place without our Realme of *England*, or within the same, that our Executours, assoon as conveniently they may, shall cause all Divine Service accustomed for Dead Folke to be celebrate for us, in the nixt and most propire Place where it shall fortune us to depart out of this Transitory Lief.

And over that we will, that whensoever or wheresoever it shall pleas God to call us out of this Transitory Lief to his Infinite Mercy and Grace, be it within this Realme, or without, that our Executours, in as goodly, brief, and convenient hast, as they reasonably canne, or may, ordeyn, prepare, and cause our Body to be removed, conveyed, and brought into the sayd College of *Windsour*; and the Service of *Placebo* and *Dirige*, with a Sermon and Masse on the Morowe, at our Coste and Charge, devoutly to be done, observed, and solemply kept, there to be buryed and enterred in the Place appointed for our sayd Tombe, to be made for the same Entent; and all this to be doon, in as devout wise, as canne, or may be doon; and we will and charge our Executours, that they dispose and give in Aulmes to the moost poore and neddy People, that may be found, commyn Beggars, as moch as may be, avoyded, in as short Space as possibly they may, after our Departure out of this Transitory Lief, Oon Thousand Marke of Lawfull Money of *England*, Part in the same Place, and thereabout, where it shall pleas Almighty God to call us to his Mercy, Part by the way, and Part in the same Place of our Buryall, after their Discretions; and to move the poore People, that shall have our Almez, to pray hartly unto God for Remission of our Offenses, and the Wealth of our Soul.

Also we woll, that with as convenient Spede as may be doon after, our Departure out of this Woorld, if it be not doon in our Life, that the Deane and Channons of



our Free Chaple of Sainct *George*, within our Castle of *Windefor*, shall have Manours, Lande, Tenement, and Spiritual Promotions, to the Yerly Value of Sixe Hundred Pounds, over all Charge made sure to them, to them and their Successours for ever, upon these Conditions hereafter ensuying.

Int' Lin'.

And for the due and full Accomplishment and Performaunce of all other Things conteyned with the same, in the Forme of an Indenture, signed with our own Hande, which shall be passed by way of Covenaut for that Purpose, betwen the sayd Deane and Cannons, and our Executours, if it passe not betwen us and the sayd Deane and Cannons *in our Lief; that is to saye, the sayd Deane and Cannons*, and their Successours for ever, shall fynde twoo Priests to say Masses at the sayd Aulter, to be made where we have before appointed our Tombe to be made and stand; and also, after our Decease, keepe yerely Four solempne *Obits* for us within the sayd College of *Windefour*; and at every of the same *Obits*, to cause a solempne Sermon to be made.

And also, at every of the sayd *Obits*, to give to poore People in Almez, Tenne Pounds.

And also to give for ever yerly, to Thirtene poore Men, which shall be called Poore-Knights, to every of them Twelf Pens every Daye, and ones in the Yere yerely for ever, a long Goun of White Cloth, with the Garter upon the Brest, embrodered with a Shelde and Crosse of Sainct *George* within the Garter, and a Mantel of Red Cloth; and to such one of the sayd Thirtene Poore Knights, as shall be appointed to be Hed and Governour of them, *iiij l. vjs. viij d.* yerely for ever, over and beside the sayd Twelf Pennes by the Day.

And also to cause every *Sunday* in the Yere for ever, a Sermon to be made for ever at *Windefour* afore sayd, as in the sayd Indenture and Covenaut shall be more fully and particularly expressed. Willing, charging, and requyring our Sonne Prince *Edward*, all our Executours and Counsellours, which shall be named hereafter, and all other our Heirs and Successours, which shall be Kings of this Realme, as they will aunswer before Almighty God at the dreadful Day of Judgment, that they, and every of them do see, that the sayd Indenture and Assurance to be made betwene us and the sayd Deane and



and Channons, or betwen them and our Executours, and all Things therein conteyned, may be duely put in Execution, and observed and kept for ever perpetuelly, according to this our Last Will and Testament.

And as concerning the Ordre and Disposition of Thimperial Crowne of this Realme of *England* and *Irland*, with our Title of *Fraunce*, and all Dignityes, Honours, Preeminences, Prerogatives, Authorityes, and Jurisdictions to the same annexed, or belonging, and for the sure Establisment of the Succession of the same.

And also for a full and plain Gift, Disposition, Assignment, Declaration, Limitation, and Appointment, with what Conditions our Doughters *Mary* and *Elizabeth* shall severally have, hold, and enjoye the sayd Imperial Crowne, and other the Premisses; after our Decease; and for Default of Issue, and Heirs of the severall Bodyes of us, and of our Sonne Prince *Edward*, lawfully begotten, and his Heires.

And also for a full Gift, Disposition, Assignment, Declaration, Limitation, and Appointement, to whom, and of what Estate, and in what Manner, Form, and Condition, the sayde Imperial Crowne, and other the Premisses shall remayne, and cum after our Deceasse; and for Default of Issue, and Heires of the severall Bodyes of us, and of our sayd Sonne Prince *Edward*, and of our sayd Doughters *Mary* and *Elizabeth*, lawfully begotten; we, by these Presents, do make and declare our Last Will and Testament, concerning the sayd Imperial Crowne, and all other the Premisses, in Manner and Form following:

That is to say, we will by these Presents, that immediately after our Departure out of this present Lief, our sayd Sonne *Edward* shall have and enjoye the sayd Imperial Crowne and Realme of *England* and *Irlande*, our Title to *Fraunce*, with all Dignityes, Honours, Preeminences, Prerogatives, Authorites, and Jurisdictions, Lands, and Possessions to the same annexed, or belonging, to him, and to his Heires of his Body lawfully begotten.

And for Default of such Issue of our sayd Sonne Prince *Edward*'s Bodye lawfully begotten, we will the sayd Imperial Crowne, and other the Premisses, after our two Deceasse, shall holly remayn and cum to the  
Heires



Heires of our Body lawfully begotten of the Body of our entierly beloved Wief Quene *Katheryn* that now is, or of any other our lawfull Wief, that we shall hereafter marry.

And for Lack of such Issue and Heires, we will also, that after our Deceasse, and for Default of Heires of the several Bodyes of us, and of our sayd Sonne Prince *Edward* lawfully begotten, the sayd Imperial Crowne, and all other the Premisses, shall holly remayn and cum  
 Int' Lin' to our sayd Doughter *Mary*, and the Heires of her Body lawfully begotten, upon Condition, that our sayd Doughter *Mary*, after our Deceasse, shall not mary, ne take any Personne to her Husbande, without the Assent and Consent of the Privy-Counsaillours, and others appointed by us, our deereft Sonne Prince *Edward* aforesayd to be of Counsaill, or of the moost Part of them, or the moost Part of such as shall then be alyve, thereunto before the sayd Mariage had in Writting, sealed with their Seales.

All which Condition we declare, limite, appoint, and will by these Presents, shall be knitt and invested to the sayd Estate of our sayd Doughter *Mary* in the sayd Imperial Crowne, and other the Premisses. And if it fortune our sayd Doughter *Mary* to dye without Issue of her Body lawfully begotten, we will, that after our Deceasse, and for Default of Issue of the several Bodyes of us, and of our sayd Sonne Prince *Edward*, lawfully begotten, and of our Doughter *Mary*, the sayd Imperial Crowne, and other the Premisses shall holly remayn and cum to our sayd Doughter *Elizabeth*, and to the Heires of her Body lawfully begotten, upon Condition that our sayd Doughter *Elizabeth*, after our Deceasse, shall not mary, nor take any Personne to her Husbande, without the Assent and Consent of the Privy-Counsaillers, and others appointed by us to be of Counsaill with our sayd deereft Sonne Prince *Edward*, or the moost Part of them, or the moost Part of such of them, as shall be thenne enlyve, thereunto before the sayd Mariage had in Writting, sealed with their Seales; which Condition we declare, limite, appoint, and will by these Presents, shall be to the sayd Estate of our sayd Doughter *Elizabeth* in the sayd Imperial Crown, and other the Premisses, knitt and invested.

And



And if it shall fortune our say'd Doughter *Elizabeth* to dye without Issue of her Body lawfully Begotten, we will, that after our Deceasse, and for default of Issue of the severall Bodyes of us, and of our say'd Sonne Prince *Edward*, and of our say'd Doughters *Mary* and *Elizabeth*.

We will that the say'd Imperial Crowne and other the Premisses, after our Deceasse, and for default of Thissue of the severall Bodyes of us, and of our say'd Sonne Prince *Edward*, and of our say'd Doughters *Mary* and *Elizabeth*, lawfully Begotten, shall holly remayn and cum to the Heires of the Body of the Lady *Fraunces* our Niepce, eldest Doughter to our late Suster the *French* Quene, lawfully Begotten; and for default of such Issue of the Body of the say'd *Fraunces*, we will that the say'd Imperial Crowne and other the Premisses, after our Deceasse, and for default of Issue of the severall Bodyes of us, and of our Sonne Prince *Edwarde*, and of our Doughters *Mary* and *Elizabeth*, and of the Lady *Fraunces*, lawfully Begotten, shall holly remayn and cum to the Heires of the Body of the Lady *Elyanore* our Niepce, second Doughter to our say'd late Sister the *French* Quene, lawfully Begotten. And if it happen the say'd Lady *Elyanore* to dye without Issue of her Body lawfully Begotten, we will, that after our Deceasse, and for default of Issue of the severall Bodyes of us, and of our say'd Sonne Prince *Edwarde*, and of our say'd Doughters *Mary* and *Elizabeth*, and of the say'd Lady *Fraunces*, and of the say'd Lady *Elyanore*, lawfully Begotten, the say'd Imperial Crowne, and other the Premisses, shall holly remayn and cum to the next rightfull Heirs. Also we will, that if our say'd Doughter *Mary* doo mary without the Consent and Agrèement of the Privy Counsaylours, and others appoincted by us to be of Counsail to our say'd Sonne Prince *Edwarde*, or the moost Part of them, or the moost Part of such of them as shall thenne be alyve, thereunto before the say'd Mariage had in Writting, sealed with their Seales, as is aforesaid; that thenne and from thensforth, for lack of Heires of the severall Bodyes of us, and of our said Sonne Prince *Edwarde*, lawfully Begotten, the sayd Imperial Crowne, and other the Premisses shall holly remayn, be, and cum to our say'd Doughter *Elizabeth*, and to the Heires of her

n

Body



Body, lawfully Begotten, in such Maner and Forme, as though our say'd Daughter *Mary* wer thenne dead, without any Issue of the Body of our say'd Doughter *Mary*, lawfully Begotten, any thing conteyned in this our Will, or in any Act of Parliament, or Statute to the contrary, in any wise notwithstanding; and in case our say'd Doughter the Lady *Mary*, do kepe and parforme the say'd Condition, expresse, declared, and limited to her Estate in the say'd Imperial Crowne, and other the Premisses by this our last Will declared.

And that our say'd Doughter *Elizabeth* for her Parte, do not kepe and parforme the say'd Condition declared and limited by this our last Will, to the Estate of the say'd Lady *Elizabeth*, in the say'd Imperial Crown of this Realme of *England* and *Irlande*, and other the Premisses, we will that thenne and from thensforth, after our Deceasse, and for lack of Heires of the severall Bodies of us; and of our say'd Sonne Prince *Edward*, and of our say'd Daughter *Mary*, lawfully Begotten, the say'd Imperial Crown, and other the Premisses, shall holly remayn and cum to the next Heires, lawfully Begotten, of the Body of the say'd Lady *Fraunces*, in such Manner and Forme, as though the say'd Lady *Elizabeth* wer then dead, without any Heire of her Body lawfully Begotten. Any thing conteyned in this Will, or in any Act, or Statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Remaindres over, for lack of Issue of the say'd Lady *Fraunces* lawfully Begotten, to be and continue to such Personnes like Remaindres and Estate, as is before limited and declared.

Also we being now at this Tyme, thanks be to Almighty God, of perfect Memory, do constitute and ordeyne these Personages following our Executours, and Parformers of this our last Will and Testament, willing, commaunding, and praying them to take upon them Thoccupation and Parformance of the same, as Executours.

That is to say, Tharchebishop of *Cantorbury*, the Lord *Wriothesly* Chancellor of *England*, the Lord *St. John* Master of our House.

Therle of *Hertford*, Great Chambrelain of *Englande*.

The Lord *Russel*, Lord Privy Seale.

The Visconte *Lisle*, High Admiral of *Englande*.

The



The Bishop *Tunstall* of *Duresme*.

Sir *Anthony Brown* Knight, Master of our Horſe.

Sir *Edward Mountagu* Knight, Chief Juge of the Comyn Place.

Justice *Bromley*.

Sir *Edward North* Knight, Chancellour of Thaugmentations.

Sir *William Paget* Knight, our Chief Secretary.

Sir *Anthony Denny*, Sir *William Harbard* Knights, chief Gentlemen of our Privey Chambre.

Sir *Edward Wootton* Knight, and Mr. Doctor *Wootton* his Brother.

And all theſe we woll to be our Executours and Counſaillours of the Privy Counſaill with our ſay'd Sonne Prince *Edwarde*, in all Maters concerning both his private Affayres, and publick Affayres of the Realme.

Willing, and charging them, and every of them, as they muſt and ſhall aunſwer at the Day of Judgement, truely and fully to ſee this my laſt Will parformed in all thinges, with as mooch ſpede and diligence as may be; and that noon of them preſume to medle with any of our Treafeur, or to do any thing appoincted by our ſay'd Will alone, onleſs the mooſt Part of the hole Nombre of their Coexecutours doo conſent, and by Writting agree to the ſame.

And will that our ſay'd Executours, or the mooſt Part of them, may lawfully do what they ſhall thinke mooſte convenient for Thexecution of this our Will, without being troubled by our ſay'd Sonne, or any others, for the ſame.

Willing farther by this our laſt Will and Teſtament, That Sir *Edmund Peckham* our truſty Servaunt, and yet Coferar of our Houſe, ſhall be Treafurer, and have the Receipt and Laying out of all ſuch Treafeur and Moneſy, as ſhall be defray'd by our Executours for the Parformaunce of this our laſt Will; ſtraictly chardging and commaunding the ſay'd Sir *Edmunde*, that he pay no great Somme of Money, but he have firſte the Haunds of our ſay'd Executours, or of the mooſt Part of them, for his Diſcharge, touching the ſame; charging him further upon his Allegeaunce, to make a true Accompt of all ſuch Sommes, as ſhall be delivered to his Handes for this Purpoſe. And ſithens we have now named  
and



and constituted our Executours, we woll and charge them, that furst and above all thinges, as they will aunswer before God, and as we put our singuler Trust and Confidence in them, that they cause all our due Debts, that can be reasonnably shewed and proved before them, to be truly contented and pay'd, assone as they conveniently can, or may, after our Deceas, without longer Delaye.

And that they do execute these Poincts *Furst*. That is to say, the Payment of our Debts, with Redres of Injuries, if any such can be duely proved, though to us they be unknowen, before any other Part of this our Will and Testament, our Buryall Exequyes and Funerals only excepted.

Furthermore We woll, that all such Graunts and Gifts, as we have made, gyven, or promised to any, which be not yet parfaicted under our Signe, or any our Seales, as they ought to be, and all such Recompenses for Exchaunges, Sales, or any other thing or things, as ought to have been made by us, and be not yet accomplished, shall be parfaicted in every Point towards all maner of Men, for Discharge of our Conscience; charging our Executors, and all the rest of our Counsaillers, to see the same done, parformed, finished, and accomplished in every Poinct, forseing, that the say'd Gifts, Graunts, Promisses, and Recompenses shall appere to our say'd Executours, or the moost Part of them, to have been graunted, made, accorded, or promised by us in any maner wise.

Further, According to the Lawes of Almighty God, and for the Fatherly Love which we beare to our Sonne Prince *Edwarde*, and to this our Realme, we declare Him, according to Justice, Equite, and Conscience, to be our Lawfull Heire; and do give and bequeath unto Him the Succession of our Realmes of *Englande* and *Irlande*, with our Title of *Fraunce*, and all our Dominions, both on this side the Sees and beyond, (a convenient Portion for our Will and Testament to be reserved.)

Also we give unto Him all our Plate, Stuff of Household, Artilery, Ordenaunce, Munitions, Ships, Cabelle, and all other Things and Implements to them belonging, and Money also, and Jewelz, saving such Portions, as shall satisfye this our last Will and Testament, charging,  
and



and commanding Him, on peyne of our Curſe, ſeing He hath ſo loving a Father of us ; and that our chief Labour and Study in this Woorld is, to eſtabliſh Him in the Crowne Imperial of this Realme, after our Decéaſſe, in ſuch ſort as may be pleaſing to God, and to the Wealth of this Realme, and to his owne Honour and Quyet ; that he be ordered and ruled both in his Mariage, and alſo in ordering of Thaffaires of the Realme, as well outward as inwarde ; and alſo in all his owne private Affaires ; and in gyving of Offices of Charge by Thadvise and Counſail of our Right entirely-beloved Counſaillours,

Tharchbiſhop of *Cantorbury*,  
The Lord *Wriotheſley*, Chancellour of *England*;  
The Lord *St. John*, Great Maſter of our Houſe;  
The Lord *Ruffel*, Lord Privey Seale;  
Therle of *Hertford*, Great Chambrelaine of *Englande*;  
The Viſcount *Liſle*, High Admiral of *Englande*;  
The Biſhop of *Dureſme*, *Tunſtall*,  
Sir *Anthoyn*e Brown, Maſter of our Horſe;  
Sir *William* Paget, our chief Secretarye;  
Sir *Anthony* Denny;  
Sir *William* Herberd;  
Juſtices *Montague* and *Bromley*;  
Sir *Edward* Wootton, and Mr. Doctor *Wootton*;  
And Sir *Edward* North;

Whom we ordeyn, name, and appoint, and by theſe Preſents, ſigned with our Hand, do make and conſtitute of Privey Counſail with our ſaid Sonne ; and woll, that they have the Gouvernement of our moolt deere Sonne Prince *Edward*, and of all our Realmes, Dominions, and Subjectz, and of all Thaffaires publicq and private, untill he ſhall have fully accompleted the Eightenth Yere of his Age. And for becauſe the Variete and Nombre of Things, Affaires, and Maters, ar and may be ſuch, as we not knowing the certainty of them before, cannot conveniently preſcribe a certain Order or Rule unto our foreſaid Counſaillours for their Behavours and Proceedings in this Charge, which we have now, and do appoint unto them about our ſay'd Sonne, during the Tyme of his Minorite aforeſay'd.

We therefor, for the ſpeciall Truſt and Confidence which we have in them, woll, and by theſe Preſents



do give and graunt full Powre and Authorite unto our sayd Counsaillours, that they all, or the moost part of them, being assembled togidres in Counsaill; or if any of them fortune to dye, the more Part of them, which shall be for the tyme lyving, being assembled in Counsaill togidres, shall, and may make, devise, and ordeyn what things soever they, or the more Part of them, as aforseyd, shall, during the Minorite aforseyde of our said Sonne, think meet, necessary, or convenient, for the Benefite, Honour, and Surety, or the Weale, Profit, or Commodite of our sayd Sonne, his Realmes, Dominions, or Subjectz, or the Discharge of our Conscience: And the same things devised, made, or ordeyned by them, or the more Part of them as aforseyd, shall, and may lawfully do, execute, and accomplishe, or cause to be done, executed, and accomplished, by their Discretions, or the Discretions of the more Part of them, as aforseyde, in as large and ample maner, as if we had or did expresse unto them, by a more special Commission undir our Great Seale of *Englande*, every particular Cause, that may chaunce or occurre during the Tyme of our Sonnes sayde Minorite, and the self-same maner of Proceeding, which they shall for the tyme think meet to use and follow.

Willing and charging our sayd Sonne, and all others which shall hereafter be Counsaillours to our sayd Sonne, that they never charge, molest, trouble, nor disquyet our forseyde Counsaillours, nor any of them, for the devising, or doing, nor any other Personne for the doing of that they shall devise, or the more Part of them devise, or do, assembled as aforsaide.

And we do charge expressely the same our entierly beloved Counsaillours and Executours, that they shall take upon them the Rule and Charge of our sayd Sonne and Heire, in all his Causes and Affaires, and of the hole Realme, doing neverthelesse all things, as under him, and in his Name, until our sayde Sonne and Heire shall be bestowed and maryed by their Advise, and that the Eightenth Yere be expyred.

Willing and desyring furthermore our forseyd trusty Counsaillours, and then all our trusty and assured Servauntz, and *Thirdly*, all other our loving Subjectz, to  
ayde



ayde and assist our fornamed Counsaillours in The execution of the Premisses, during the forsayde Tyme.

Not doubting but they will in all things deale so truely and uprightly, as they shall have cause to think them well chosen for the Charge committed unto them.

Straightly charging our sayd Counsaillours and Executours, and in God's Name we exhort them, that for the singular Trust and speciall Confidence, which we have and ever had in them, to have a due and diligent Eye, perfect Zeale, Love, and Affection to the Honour, Surety, Estate, and Dignitye of our sayde Sonne, and the good State and Prosperite of this our Realme.

And that all Delayeres sett apart, they will ayde and assiste our sayde Counsaillours and Executours to the Parformance of this our present Testament and last Will in every Part, as they will answer before God at the Day of Judgement,

*Cum venerit Judicare vivos & mortuos.*

And furthermore, for the special Trust and Confidence which we have in the Erles of *Arundel* and *Essex* that now be, Sir *Thomas Cheney* Knight, Treasurer of our Household, Sir *John Gage* Knight, Comptroler of our Household, Sir *Anthony Wingfeld* Knight, our Vice-Chambrelayn, Sir *William Petre* Knight, oon of our twoo Principall Secretaryes, Sir *Richard Rich* Knight, Sir *John Baker* Knight, Sir *Roufe Sadleyr* Knight, Sir *Thomas Seymour* Knight, Sir *Richard Southwell*, and Sir *Edmund Peckham* Knights, they, and every of them shall be of Counsayl for the ayding and assisting of the fornamed Counsaillours, and our Executours, when they, or any of them shall be called by our sayd Executours, or the more Part of the same.

*Item*, We bequethe to our Doughters *Mary* and *Elizabeth*'s Mariages, they being maryed to any outward Potentate, by Thadvise of the forsayd Counsaillours, if we bestow them not in our Life-time, Ten Thousand Pounds in Money, Plate, Jewelz, and Household-Stuffe, for ech of them; or a larger Somme, as to the Discretion of our Executours, or the more Part of them, shall be thought convenient: Willing them, on my Blessing, to be



be ordred, as well in Mariage, as in all other lawfull Things, by Thadvise of our forsayd Counsaillours; and in case they will not, thenne the Somme to be minished at the Counsaillours Discretion.

Further our Will is, that from the furst Howre of our Death, until such Tyme, as the sayde Counsaillours canne provide, either of them, or bothe, of sum honourable Mariages, they shall have eche of them Three Thousand Pounds, *ultra Réprisas*, to live on; willing and charging the forsayde Counsaillours, to limite and appoint to either of them, such sage Officers, and Ministers for ordering thereof, as it may be employed both to our Honour and theirs.

And for the great Love, Obedyence, Chastnes of Lief, and Wisedome, being in our fornamed Wief and Quene, we bequeth unto her for her proper Use, and as it shall pleas her to ordre it, Thre Thousand Pounds in Plate, Jewelz, and Stuff of Household, besides such Apparail, as shall pleas her to take of such as she hath alredy. And further we give unto her One Thousand Pounds in Money, with the enjoying of her Dower and Jointer, according to our Graunt by Act of Parliament.

Furthermore, for the Kindnes and good Service that our sayd Executours have shewed unto us, we gyve and bequeth to eche of them, such Sommes of Money, or the Value of the same, as hereafter ensuith.

|                                                    | C.        |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>First</i> , To Tharchbishop of Cantorbury . . . | v Marks   |
| To the Lord Wriothesley . . . . .                  | v Lib.    |
| To the Lord St. John . . . . .                     | v Lib.    |
| To the Lord Russel . . . . .                       | v Lib.    |
| To the Erle of Hertford . . . . .                  | v Lib.    |
| To the Viscount Lisle . . . . .                    | v Lib.    |
| To the Bishop of Duresme . . . . .                 | iiij Lib. |
| To Sir Anthony Brown . . . . .                     | iiij Lib. |
| To Sir William Paget . . . . .                     | iiij Lib. |
| To Sir Anthony Denny . . . . .                     | iiij Lib. |
| To Sir William Herbert . . . . .                   | iiij Lib. |
| To Justice Montague . . . . .                      | iiij Lib. |
| To Justice Bromley . . . . .                       | iiij Lib. |
| To Sir Edward North . . . . .                      | iiij Lib. |
| To Sir Edward Wootton . . . . .                    | iiij Lib. |
| To Mr. Doctor Wootton . . . . .                    | iiij Lib. |

Also



Also for the speciall Love and Favour, that we bear to our Trusty Counsaillours, and other our say'd Servaunts hereafter following, we give and bequeth unto them such Sommes of Money, or the Value thereof, as is lotted upon their Hede.

|                                                    | C.       |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------|
| <i>First, To Therle of Essex</i>                   | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Thomas Cheney</i>                        | ij Lib.  |
| To the Lord <i>Herberd</i>                         | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>John Gage</i>                            | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Thomas Seymour</i>                       | ij Lib.  |
| To <i>John Gates</i>                               | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Thomas Darcy Knight</i>                  | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Thomas Speke Knight</i>                  | ij Marks |
| To Sir <i>Philip Hobby Knight</i>                  | ij Marks |
| To Sir <i>Thomas Paston</i>                        | ij Marks |
| To Sir <i>Maurice Barkley</i>                      | ij Marks |
| To Sir <i>Rafe Sadleyr</i>                         | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Thomas Carden</i>                        | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Peter Meutes</i>                         | ij Marks |
| To <i>Edward Belingham</i>                         | ij Marks |
| To <i>Thomas Audley</i>                            | ij Marks |
| To <i>Edmunde Harman</i>                           | ij Marks |
| To <i>John Pen</i>                                 | j Marks  |
| To <i>Henry Nevil</i>                              | j Lib.   |
| To <i>Symbarbe</i>                                 | j Lib.   |
| To <i>Cooke</i>                                    | j Lib.   |
| To <i>John Osburn</i>                              | j Lib.   |
| To <i>David Vincent</i>                            | j Lib.   |
| To <i>James Rufforth</i> , Keeper of our Hous here | j Marks  |
| To <i>Cecill</i> , Yoman of our Robes              | j Marks  |
| To <i>Sternhold</i> , Grome of our Robes           | j Marks  |
| To <i>John Rouland</i> , Page of our Robes         | 1. Lib.  |
| To Therle of <i>Arundell</i> , Lord Chambrelain    | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Anthony Wingfeld</i> , Viz Chambrelain   | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Edmund Peckham</i>                       | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Richard Riche</i>                        | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>John Baker</i>                           | ij Lib.  |
| To Sir <i>Richard Southwell</i>                    | ij Lib.  |
| To Mr. Doctor <i>Owen</i>                          | j Lib.   |
| To Mr. Doctor <i>Wendy</i>                         | j Lib.   |
| To Mr. Doctor <i>Cromer</i>                        | j Lib.   |
| To <i>Alsop</i>                                    | j Marks  |



|                                                                                |          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| To Patrick                                                                     | j Marks  |
| To Ayloff                                                                      | j Marks  |
| To Ferrys                                                                      | j Marks  |
| To Henry                                                                       | j Marks  |
| To Hollande                                                                    | j Marks  |
| To the Foure Gentlemen Huishers of our<br>Chambre, being dayly Wayters, in all | ij. Lib. |

And we will also, that our Executours, or the more Part of them, shall give Ordre for the Payment of such Legacies, as they shall think meet to such our Ordinary Servauntz, as unto whom we have not appointed any Legacye by this our present Testament.

Finally, this present Writing in Paper, we ordeyn and make our Last Will and Testament, and will the same to be reputed and taken to all Entents and Purposes, for our good, strong, vailable, moost parfait, and Last Will and Testament, and do declare all other Wills and Testaments made at any Tyme by us, to be voyd, and of Non Effect.

In Witness whereof we have signed it with our Hand in our Palays of *Westminster*, the Thirty Day of *Decembre*, in the Yere of our Lord God A Thousand Fyve Hundred Fourty and Six, after the Computation of the Church of *England*, and of our Reign the Eight and Thirty Yere.

Being present, and called to be Witnesses, these Persones which have written their Names herunder.

*Henry R.*

*John Gates.*

*George Owen.*

*Thomas Wendye.*

*Robert Huycke.*

*E. Harman.*

*Wylliam Sayntbarbe.*

*Henry Nevell.*

*Richarde Coke.*

*David Vincent.*

*Patzee.*

*W. Clerk.*

Under his Royal Signet  
of Red Wax hanging  
by White and Green  
Ribbons.

The Will is written  
in Paper.



N U M B. IX.

*Speech of the Lord Chancellor Ellesmere in the Exchequer Chamber, touching the Postnati, p. 104.*

**I**N some Special Cases, there sometime may be a King of Subjects without Land in Possession, as Justice *Fenner* noted in the Government, which *Moses* had over the People of *Israel* in the Wilderness; and as in the Case, which *Sir John Popham*, the late Lord Chief Justice, did put in the Parliament: If a King and his Subjects be driven out of his Kingdom by his Enemies, yet notwithstanding he continueth still King over those Subjects, and they are still bound unto him by their Bond of Allegiance, wheresoever he, and they be: But there cannot be a King of Land without Subjects; for that were but *Imperium in belluas*, and *Rex & subditi sunt Relativa*.

*The Argument of Sir Francis Bacon Solicitor-General, in the Case of the Postnati, in the Exchequer Chamber, before the Lord Chancellor, and all the Judges of England. Resuscitatio, Second Part, p. 52, 53.*

**T**O maintain our Assertion (that it sufficeth to Naturalization, that there be one King, and that the Party be *natus ad fidem Regis*) I will use three Kinds of Proofs.

The first is, that Allegiance cannot be applied to the Law or Kingdom, but to the Person of the King; because the Allegiance of the Subject is more large and spacious, and hath a greater Latitude and Comprehension, than the Law, or the Kingdom; and therefore it cannot be a Dependency of that, without the which it may of itself subsist.

The second Proof, which I shall use, is, That the Natural Body of the King hath an Operation and Influence into his Body Politick, as well as his Body Politick hath upon his Body Natural: And therefore, that although his Body Politick of King of *England*, and his Body Politick of King of *Scotland*, be several and distinct; yet nevertheless his Natural Person, which is one, hath an Operation upon both, and createth a Privity between them.

And



And the third Proof is, The binding Text of five several Statutes.

For the first of these, I shall make it manifest, that the Allegiance is of a greater Extent and Dimension, than Laws or Kingdom, and cannot consist by the Laws meerly; because it began before Laws, it continueth after Laws, and it is in Vigour where Laws are suspended, and have not their Force.

That it is more ancient than Law, appeareth by that, which was spoken in the Beginning by Way of Inducement, where I did endeavour to demonstrate, that the original Age of Kingdoms was govern'd by Natural Equity; that Kings were more ancient, than Lawgivers; that the first Submissions were simple, and upon Confidence to the Person of Kings; and that the *Allegiance of Subjects to Hereditary Monarchy*, can no more be said to consist by Laws, than the *Obedience of Children to Parents*.

That Allegiance continueth after Laws, I will only put the Case, which was remember'd by two great Judges in a great Assembly, the one of them now with God, which was; *That if a King of England should be expuls'd his Kingdom, and some particular Subjects should follow him in Flight or Exile in Foreign Parts, and any of them there should conspire his Death; that upon his Recovery of his Kingdom, such a Subject might, by the Law of England, be proceeded with, for Treason committed and perpetrated, at what Time he had no Kingdom, and in Place where the Law did not bind.*

That Allegiance is in Force, where the Power of Law hath a Cessation, appeareth notably in Time of Wars; for *silent Leges inter Arma*. And yet the Sovereignty and Imperial Power of the King, is so far from being then extinguished, as contrarywise it is raised, and made more absolute; for then he may proceed by his Supreme Authority, and Martial Law, without observing Formalities of the Laws of his Kingdom. Thus far Sir Francis Bacon.

These Passages shew, that it was the declared Opinion (and it appears not to have been contradicted) of a Lord Chancellor, two Judges, and a Solicitor-General, after Lord Chancellor, That Allegiance was due to a King dispossessed; That Treason might be committed against



against him, and was punishable by the Law of *England* after his Restoration. In the Case proposed, it cannot be doubted, but that the precedent Revolutions were in View, in all which, when one King was *driven out*, another took Possession.

It will be objected, that in the Case proposed, Allegiance is said to be due to the King expelled (not by all, but only) by the *particular Subjects, who follow him in Exile*.

To this the Answer may be, That these great Lawyers, by affirming, that Allegiance is due to the King *expulsed, by the Subjects who follow him*, seem to have taught plainly, that it was due to him by all the Subjects: They affirm'd it of *some Particulars*, of whom they thought it could not be deny'd; and it seem'd superfluous to add, that the Obligation was the same on all the Subjects; because that follow'd evidently, as it appears to do from the Passages cited, and from the Reasons and Resolutions, on which that Case of the *Post-nati* was determin'd.

1. The Instance of Allegiance due to a *King expuls'd* is brought to prove, that Allegiance is due to the King's Person, not to the Law, or Crown, or Kingdom; and supposing it due by all the Subjects to a *King expuls'd*, the Proof is evident: But if Allegiance is due by all the Subjects in the Kingdom to the King who possesses it, then this Instance disproves the Assertion it is brought to prove: For if the *King expuls'd*, by losing the Kingdom, loses the Allegiance of all the Subjects in it; it follows, that Allegiance was not due to the King's Person, but to the Crown or Kingdom, or that it was due (a) *more by reason of the King's Crown (that is of his Politique Capacity) than by reason of the Person of the King*, which damnable and damned Opinion, saith the Lord Coke, was invented by the Spencers.

(a) Coke's Reports, lib. 7. Calvin's Case, p. 11.

2. Sir F. Bacon affirms, that Allegiance was due before Laws, continueth when they cease by Expulsion, and is in Vigour when they are suspended by War: But the Duty of Allegiance in the first and last Case, must be extended to all the Subjects, therefore in the second; and his Reason proves it; for if Allegiance depends not on the Law, it is equally due by all the



Subjects, when the Law is suspended, when it ceases, and before it had Being.

(b) Coke, *ibid.* p. 4.

(c) *Ibid.* p. 24.

(d) Lord Ellesmere, p. 101.

3. (b) *Ligeance and Obedience is an Incident inseparable to every Subject; ----- it joins together the Sovereign and all his Subjects quasi uno Ligamine.* (c) *Whosoever are born under one Natural Ligeance and Obedience, owe it by the Law of Nature to one Sovereign:* (d) *There is but one King and Sovereign, to whom this Faith and Allegiance is due by all his Subjects:* That the Natural Subjects of England may owe Allegiance to two Kings, that are Enemies, some to one, others to the other, is a monstrous Assertion, unknown to all Laws and Lawyers.

(e) Coke, *ibid.* p. 12, 25.

4. In this Case it being agreed, (e) *That the Ligeance or Faith of the Subject is due unto the King by the Law of Nature, part of the Law of England; this Inference was drawn, That it cannot be alter'd; and because it was unalterable, it was not due by the Law and Constitution of Man:* But if Ligeance alway deserts the Unhappy, and enrolls under Success, the Law immutable changes with the Wind, and is more imperfect than humane Law, which never deprives any Man of his Right, because he is dispossess'd unjustly.

(f) *Ibid.* p. 10.

5. It was affirm'd, (f) *That the King holdeth the Kingdom of England by Birthright inherent, by Descent from the Blood Royal, whereupon Succession doth attend: And therefore it is usually said, to the King, his Heirs, and Successors, wherein Heirs is first nam'd, and Successors is attendant upon Heirs; and again it is concluded, (g) That our Ligeance is due unto our Natural Liege Sovereign, descended of the Blood Royal of this Realm; and again it manifestly appeareth, that to him the Ligeance or Faith of the Subject is Proprium quarto modo, omni, soli, semper.*

(g) *Ibid.* p. 12.

(h) *Ibid.* p. 10.

6. (h) *It was resolved, that it was due to the Natural Person of the King (which is ever accompanied with the Politick Capacity, and the Politick Capacity as it were appropriated to the Natural Capacity) and is not due to the Politick Capacity only: Hence the Inference seems natural, that wherever the Person is, there is the Natural, and there the Politick Capacity appropriated to it.*

(i) P. 7, 9.

7. It was determin'd, that the Ligeance of Natural Subjects (i) *is not circumscrib'd within any Place, but is to be paid in all Places whatsoever; and the Reason given is,*



is, that Ligeance is a *Quality of the Mind*, not confined within any Place. He that is abjur'd the Realm, amittit Regnum, sed non regem; amittit patriam, sed non patrem; for notwithstanding the Abjuration, he oweth the King his Ligeance, and he remaineth within the King's Protection; for the King may pardon, and restore him to his Country again. But when a Subject is abjur'd, and in a Foreign Country, what Subjection can he actually pay, what Protection actually receive, especially in Time of War? The King in many Cases cannot protect him, or any other Subject, by the Sword; yet his Ligeance continues; wherefore when it is said, that the King's Power and Protection draweth Ligeance, this cannot be understood of actual Protection, (which is often impossible both in Foreign and in Civil War) but of the King's Obligation to protect, as he has Power: For thus hath Coke out of Skene explain'd that Rule, which the (k) Doctor seems to understand of actual Protection. (l) Ligeance is the mutual Bond and Obligation between the King and his Subjects, whereby his Subjects are call'd his Liege Subjects; because they are bound to obey and serve him; and he is call'd their Liege Lord; because he should maintain and defend them: ----- Therefore it is truly said, that *Protectio trahit subjectionem, & subiectio Protectionem*; the *Maxim* cited by the Doctor, which a little before is thus paraphras'd, *Sicut subditus regi tenetur ad Obedientiam, ita Rex subdito tenetur ad protectionem*; the Obligation without doubt is mutual; but a Question is made, whether it is conditional, concerning which we have no Controversy.

(k) Defence,  
p. 111.  
(l) Coke,  
ibid. p. 5.

8. Lastly, (m) Treason by the Common and Statute Law may be committed by the Subjects of England in Foreign Parts: But it seems a manifest Repugnancy, that by the same Law a Subject following a King expuls'd, may be lawfully punish'd, for paying his Allegiance to him, as he may be, if it is due by Law to the Possessor; and for breaking it, as he may be also, if the King expuls'd recover his Kingdom. And from these Premises we may draw this Conclusion; that the Legal Allegiance of all Natural Subjects is due to one Sovereign; and that where it is due by one Subject, it is due by every one.

(m) Bacon,  
ibid. p. 44.



Books printed for, and sold by RICHARD SMITH at Bishop  
*Beveridge's* Head in *Pater-Noster-Row*; where Gentle-  
 men may be furnish'd with all Modern Books, and  
 Money for any Library or Parcel of Books.

F O L I O.

**G**eorgii Bulli S. Theologiae Professoris & Presbyteri Anglicani, Opera omnia,  
 quibus duo praecipui Catholicae fidei Articuli, de S. Trinitate & Justificatione,  
 orthodoxè, perspicuè, ac solidè, explanantur, illustrantur, confirmantur;  
 nunc demum in unum Volumen collecta, ac multo correctius quàm antè, uà cum  
 generalibus Indicibus Edita. Quibus jam accessit ejusdem Tractatus hæcenus ineditus,  
 de Primitiva & Apostolica Traditione dogmatis de Jesu Christi Divinitate contra  
 Danielem Zuckertum, ejusque nuperos in Anglia Sectatores; subnexa insuper pluribus  
 singulorum Librorum capitibus prelixa quædamque annotata Joannis Ernesti Grabe,  
 cujus etiam Præfatio huic Volumini est præmissa.

Septuaginta Interpretum quem ex antiquissimo MS. codice Alexandrino accurate  
 descriptum. Et ope aliorum exemplarium, ac prisenum Scriptorum, præsertim vero  
 Hexaplaris Editionis Origeniæ emendatum atque supplementum, additis sæpe Al-  
 terisorum & Obelorum signis, summa cura edidit Joannes Ernestus Grabe, S. T. P.  
 Fol. & Octavo.

The Hereditary Right of the Crown of *England* asserted; the History of the Suc-  
 cession since the Conquest clear'd; and the true *English* Constitution vindicated from  
 the Misrepresentations of *Dr. Higden's View and Defence*.

An Exposition on the 39 Articles of the Church of *England*. By Bishop *Beveridge*.

OCTAVO and DUODECIMO.

**P**Private Thoughts on Religion, digested into Twelve Articles; with Practical Reso-  
 lutions form'd thereupon: Written in his younger Years, for the settling of his  
 Principles, and Conduct of his Life. The Seventh Edition, illustrated and adorn'd  
 with Sculptures.

Private Thoughts upon a Christian Life; or necessary Directions for its Beginning  
 and Progress upon Earth, in order to its final Perfection in the Beatifick Vision. Part. II.  
 Written in his riper Years, and printed from his Original Manuscripts. The Third  
 Edition, illustrated and adorn'd with Sculptures.

The great Necessity and Advantage of Publick Prayer, and frequent Communion.  
 Design'd to revive Primitive Piety. With Meditations, Ejaculations, and Prayers, be-  
 fore, at, and after the Sacrament. The Fourth Edition; to be had both in a large  
 and small Character.

One hundred and Twenty eight Sermons, and other Discourses, on several Subjects, 10 Vol. viz.

Vol. I. Christ's Presence with his Ministers in general. The Manner of Ordination  
 in the Church of *England*. Salvation in the Church only under such a Ministry. The  
 true Notion of religious Worship. A Form of Sound Words to be used by Ministers.  
 The Church establish'd on a Rock Christianity an holy Priesthood. The preparatory  
 Duties for Holy Orders. The Efficacy of Faith in the Ministration of the Word. Mi-  
 nisters the Ambassadors of Christ. The Sacramental Benediction in the Name of the  
 Trinity, explain'd.

Vol. II. The Being and Attributes of God. The Love of God in Man's Salvation.  
 The Merits of Christ's Passion. Salvation through Fear and Trembling. The Con-  
 science void of Offence. The Knowledge of Jesus Christ preferable to all other. The  
 new Creature in Christianity. The Nature and Eternity of Heaven's Joys and Hell's  
 Torments. The Glories of Christ's Cross. The Excellency of the Soul above world-  
 ly Goods. A Spiritual Life the Characteristick of a Christian. The Obligation of  
 Superiors to promote Religion.

Vol. III. The Unity of Christ with God the Father. The Incarnation of Christ.  
 Christ the only Saviour. Christ the sole Author of Grace and Truth. Christ the Sa-  
 viour of all that come to him. Christ the only Mediator. All things to be asked in  
 the Name of Christ. Christ, as Man, is the Head over all things. Christ is our Lord,  
 and Master. The Blessed Estate of those who believe in Christ. Admission into the  
 Church of Christ by Baptism, necessary to Salvation. Coming to Christ the only  
 Means of Salvation. Abiding in Christ the only Means of universal Happiness. Bear-  
 ing much Fruit, the Characteristick of Christ's Disciples.

Vol. IV. The Usefulness of Fasting. The Sufficiency of Grace. Faith the Govern-  
 ing Principle of a Christian Life. Faith in God and Christ a Sovereign Remedy against  
 all Troubles. Faith the Principle of Love and Joy. Christ the Foundation of all the  
 Promises. God our Sovereign Good. The present Security and future Happiness of  
 the Saints. The Communion of the Saints. The Christian Prize. The New Crea-  
 tion. Steadfastness to the establish'd Church recommended.

Vol. V. The One Thing needful. Universal Obedience requisite to Salvation. The  
 Glory of God the final Cause of all things. God alone to be serv'd. The Advantages  
 of Publick Worship. The Duty of Publick Thanksgiving. The Sufficiency of Scri-

pture



piure. The Preference of Spiritual Food to Natural. The Preference of Things invisible and eternal to visible and temporal. Of Trust in God. The Nature and Necessity of Restitution.

Vol. VI. Three Sermons on *Good-Friday*. The Mystery of our Reconciliation by Christ, explain'd. The Satisfaction of Christ, explain'd. An *Easter* Sermon. Christ's Resurrection a Proof of his Divinity. Christ's Resurrection a Proof of ours. Christ's Resurrection the Cause of our Regeneration. Christ's Resurrection the Cause of our Justification. Christ's Resurrection an Object of great Joy. An *Easter* Sermon. Christ's Ascension into Heaven preparatory to ours. A *Whitsun* Sermon.

Vol. VII. The Danger of Unbelief. Faith the principal inward Purity. Faith in Christ the only Means of Overcoming the World. Faith in Christ our Title to the Privilege of Sonship. The Profession of our Faith in Christ ought to be Publick. The Profession of our Faith in Christ ought to be constant. Repentance the End of Christ's Coming into the World. Repentance a certain and the only Method of obtaining Pardon. Repentance the only Method of escaping Temporal Judgments, preach'd on the Anniversary Fast for the Fire of *London*. Repentance the only Method of escaping Eternal Judgments. Repentance and Faith the two great Branches of the Evangelical Covenant.

Vol. VIII. Holiness the great Design of the Gospel Dispensation. Christ's Life a Pattern of Holiness to Christians. The Holiness of Christians ought to be conspicuous. The Wisdom of being Holy. The Pleasure of being holy. The Advantages of being Holy. The exemplary Holiness of the Primitive Christians. Christ's Grace sufficient to make Christians holy.

Vol. IX. The Nature, Extent, and Polity of God's Kingdom on Earth. God's Omnipresence the best Guard against Sin. Perpetual Rejoicing the Duty of Christians. Universal Thanksgiving the Duty of Christians. All things to be done to the Glory of God. All things to be done in the Name of Christ. The Meditation of God's Law the good Man's Delight. The Vanity of hearing the Word of God without doing it. The Duty and Advantage of seeking Things spiritual. The Sinfulness and Mischief of worldly Anxiety. The great Duty of loving God. The great Happiness of loving God.

Vol. X. The Business of Christ's Yoke. The Christian Race. Christ the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Christ a Saviour before his Incarnation. The Presence of Christ in the Religious Assembly of Christians. The Way of seeking God so as to find him. The Way of pleasing God. The Parable of the Sower. The Blessing of Purity in Heart. Against rash Swearing. A *Spiritual* Sermon. Obedience to Governors.

N. B. In a short time will be publish'd Two more Volumes of Sermons, with an Index to the Whole, and the *Characters* by several Eminent Men.

*Theaurus Theologicus*, ; or a complete System of Divinity, summ'd up in brief Notes upon select Places of the Old and New Testament ; wherein the sacred Texts is reduced under proper Heads, explain'd, and illustrated with the Opinions and Authorities of the ancient Fathers, Councils, &c. in 4 Volumes, *Octavo*.

All these by the Right Reverend Father in God, William Beveridge, D. D. late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.

The Doctrine of the Two Covenants; the Doctrine of the Two Sacraments; and Death disarm'd of its Sting. In 3 Vol. *Octavo*. By the Right Reverend Father in God, *Ezekiel Hopkins*, D. D. late Lord Bishop of *Londonderry*. Now first publish'd from his Original Manuscripts.

Some important Points of Primitive Christianity, maintain'd and defended; in several Sermons, and other Discourses. By *George Bull*, D. D. late Lord Bishop of *St. David's*, viz.

Vol. I. The Necessity of Works of Righteousness, in order to Salvation; tho' the Reward of them is only to be expected from the Free Grace and Mercy of God, asserted against the *Antinomians* and *Papists*. That the Soul of Man subsists after Death, in a Place of Abode provided by God for it, till the Resurrection; concerning the middle State of Happiness or Misery, allotted by God to every Man presently after Death, according as he has been good or bad in his past Life, inconsistent with the Popish Doctrine of *Purgatory*. The low and mean Condition of the Blessed Virgin consider'd; as also the singular Grace and Favour of God vouchsafed to her; and that Respect which is due to her from us upon that Account, wherein the Invocation of her by the *Papists* is refuted. St. Paul's Thorn in the Flesh, the Messenger of Satan, sent to prevent his being Exalted above Measure, consider'd and explain'd; with several Practical Observations drawn from that Subject. A Visitation Sermon concerning the great Difficulty and Danger of the Priestly Office. The different Degrees of Bliss and Glory in Christ's heavenly Kingdom, answer to the different Degrees of Grace here below. Several Objections against this Doctrine are answer'd. Everlasting Life hop'd for by good Men; under the Old Testament; and that the Consideration of the Vanity of the present



present Life, is an effectual Means to make us fix our Minds upon Things eternal. What that Worthiness is, and wherein it consists, which is requir'd of those that shall be Partakers of the future heavenly Glory.

Vol. II. That the Poverty of the first Preachers of the Gospel was design'd by Providence, to convince the World of their Sincerity; and that even Persons divinely Inspired, and Ministers of God, did not so wholly depend on Divine Inspiration, but that they made use also of the ordinary Help and Means, such as Reading of Books, with Study and Meditation on them, for their Assistance in the Discharge of their Office. The Existence of Angels prov'd from Reason as well as Scripture; their Creation by God; the Fall of some of them; the Nature of the Holy Angels; their State and Condition in reference to God. The Office of the Holy Angels in reference to good Men; being appointed by God as the Ministers of his special Providence towards the Faithful; and wherein the Angelical Ministry doth more especially consist. Prescribed Forms of Prayer in the Publick Worship of God, practis'd from the very Beginning of Christianity, and was not only ancient, but useful and necessary upon many Accounts. That the Doctrine of the Recompence of Reward to be bestowed on the Righteous after this Life, was understood and believed by the People of God before the Law was given; and that it is lawful to serve God with respect to, or in hope of, the future, heavenly Recompence. That many may have a Form or Shew of Godliness, when they deny its Power, and are far from the Reality and Truth of it. A Prosperous Condition in this World is a Blessing of God, wherein we not only may, but ought to rejoice, since it is given us by God as a peculiar Time of Comfort and Rejoicing. Adversity the proper Season of serious Consideration, and so contrived by the Providence of God, that it should be intermixt with Prosperity; and this Mixture of Good and Evil so proportioned by the same Providence, that it obviates all Discontent and Murmuring against God. That it is a very sinful and vain thing for any Man so to glory in his own Wisdom, Strength, or Wealth, as to place his Trust and Confidence in either or all of them. That the religious Acknowledgment of God's Providence, in the wise and righteous Government and Disposal of all humane Affairs, join'd with an humble Dependence and firm Trust in him, in the Way of Obedience to Him, Man's best, and indeed only Security.

Vol. III. That it is Matter of great Use and Concernment, much conducing to the Purposes of Religion, seriously to consider the Shortness and Uncertainty of Life; and that such due Consideration of our short and uncertain Abode in this World, is the Gift of God, and the Effect of his Grace, which therefore ought to be sought for by humble and earnest Prayer. *Discourse 1.* The Doctrine of the Catholick Church for the first Three Ages of Christianity, concerning the Blessed Trinity, considered; in Opposition to *Sabellianism*, and *Tritheism*. *Disc. 2.* The principal Parts and Branches of the Pastoral Office, with Rules and Directions for the due Performance of each of them. *Disc. 3.* Concerning the Spirit of God in the Faithful, how and in what manner it doth bear Witness with their Spirits, that they are the Children of God; and what Degree of Hope or Persuasion concerning their Adoption, this Witness of the Spirit doth ordinarily produce in the Faithful. *Disc. 4.* The Consubstantiality and Co-eternity of the Son of God with the Father, asserted; or some few Animadversions on a Treatise of Mr. Gilbert Clerke, entitled, *Antenicensimus*, so far as the Author pretends to answer Dr. George Bull's *Defence of the Nicene Faith*. *Disc. 5.* Concerning the first Covenant, and the State of Man before the Fall; according to the Scripture, and the Sense of the Primitive Doctors of the Catholick Church. The Life of Dr. George Bull, late Lord Bishop of St. David's: With the History of those Controversies in which he was engaged. And an Abstract of those Fundamental Doctrines which he maintain'd and defended in the *Latin Tongue*. By Robert Nelson, Esq; *Octavo*.

N: B. There is some printed upon large Royal Paper, for those who are curious,

The Theory of Sciences illustrated; or the Grounds and Principles of the Seven liberal Arts, Grammar, Logick, Rhetorick, Musick, Arithmetick, Geometry, Astronomy, accurately demonstrated and reduced to Practice. With variety of Questions, Problems, and Propositions, both delightful and profitable. By H. Curson, Gent.

An Epistolary Discourse, proving from the Scriptures and the first Fathers, that the Soul is a Principle, naturally mortal; but immortaliz'd actually, by the Pleasure of God to Punishment; or to Reward, by its Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit: Wherein is proved, that none have the Power of giving this divine, immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but the Bishops. With an Hypothesis concerning Sacerdotal Absolution. The Second Edition corrected. By Henry Dodwell, A. M.

Occasional Communion, fundamentally destructive of the Discipline of the Primitive Catholick Church, and contrary to the Doctrine of the latest Scriptures, concerning Church Communion. By Henry Dodwell, M. A.

Exerci-



Exercitationes duæ : Prima de Ætate Phalaridis ; Secunda de Ætate Pythagoræ Philosophi. Ab Henrico Dodwello, A. M.

De nupero Schismate Anglicano Parænesis, ad externos tam reformatos quam etiam Pontificios quæ Jura Episcoporum vetera, eorundemque à Magistratu seculari Independentia omnibus asserenda commendantur. Ab Henrico Dodwello, A. M. Dublinienti.

The ancient Religion of the Gentiles, and Causes of their Errors consider'd : The Mistakes and Failures of the Heathen Priests and Wise-Men, in their Notions of the Deities, and Matters of Divine Worship, are examin'd ; with regard to their being altogether destitute of Divine Revelation. With a complete Index. By the Learned and Judicious Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury.

The Tale of a Tub revers'd, for the universal Improvement of Mankind ; with a Character of the Author.

The History of Charles V. Emperor and King of Spain, the great Hero of the House of Austria ; containing the most remarkable Occurrences that happen'd in the World for the Space of 55 Years, all Nations being in a greater and less Measure engaged in the Contests and Confusions of those Times ; and giving an Account, 1. How the House of Austria first came to the Crown of Spain, and whence the present Contests between the Emperor and King of France had their Original. 2. Of the Rebellion of the Commons of Spain, and the true Causes and Success of it. 3. Of the Wars with France, and taking that King Prisoner. 4. Of the Sacking of Rome. 5. Of the Reformation and Wars which ensued on that account. 6. Of the Revolutions and Troubles in Denmark and Sweden, on account of Religion. 7. Of the Affairs of England, and Marriage of King Philip and Mary Queen of England. 8. Of the Wars with the Turks. 9. Of the Taking of Tunis, and other Places of the Coast of Africa, with the unfortunate Expedition of Argiers. 10. Of the Conquest of the vast Kingdoms of Peru, and Mexico, in America. And lastly, Of the most Heroick Action of that Emperor's Life, his voluntary resigning up all his vast Dominions, and retiring to a Monastery. Written in Spanish by D. F. Prudentio de Sandoval Bishop of Pamplona, and Historiographer to King Philip III. of Spain. Made English by Captain John Stevens.

Reflexions on our common Failings. Done out of French by a Person of Honour.

The Parochial Clergyman's Duty ; or an earnest Exhortation to, 1. Such as hold constant Communion with the Established Church. 2. Such as separate from, or renounce Communion with, the Established Church. 3. The Irreligious and Profane, or such as neglect the Duties of Religion in general. Digested from the Works of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, the present Archbishop of York, Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Stillingsfleet, Dr. Sherlock, Dr. Scott, Mr. Wall, &c.

An Abstract of the most curious and excellent Thoughts of Sieur de Montaigne's Essays ; very useful for improving the Mind, and forming the Manners of Men. Done into English from the French Original.

A Conference between the Soul and Body, concerning the present and future State : Shewing how different the general Practice of Religion now is from that of the first Christians, approved and recommended to the World, by the learned Mr. Dodwell. The Second Edition. To which are added, Morning and Evening Hymns. By the Right Reverend Dr. Kenn, Bishop of Bath and Wells.

Joannis Ernesti Grabi Epistola ad clarissimum virum Dominum Joannem Millium, S. T. P. anæ S. Edmundi apud Oxonienses principalem, Ecclesiæ Cantuariensis Canonicum dignissimum ; quæ ostenditur, Libri Judicium genuinam LXX. Interpretum versionem eam esse, quam MS. codex Alexandrinus exhibet : Romanam autem Editionem, quod ad dictum Librum, ab illo prorsus diversam, atque eadem cum Hesychiana esse. Subnexa sunt Tria Nova  $\text{ἑρμῆ}$  Editionis Specimina cum variis Annotationibus.

Solon ; or Philosophy no Defence against Love. A Tragi-Comedy. With the Mask of Orpheus and Euridice. Written by Captain Martin Bladen.

A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all St. Paul's Epistles. Done by several eminent Men at Oxford ; corrected and improved by the late Reverend and Learned Bishop Fell. The Third Edition, with Additions.

Several Discourses, viz. of Covetousness ; of Confession ; of Watching and Praying ; of Christian Liberty ; on Christ's Nativity ; of Purifying the Temple, on the Resurrection ; of the Possibility of Keeping God's Laws ; of Feasting ; of Moderation ; of Superstition ; on the Martyrdom of King Charles I. All preached on particular Occasions, before the State in the Cathedral of St. Patrick's and Christ-Church, Dublin ; and collected into one Volume, by the Right Reverend Father in God William Sheridan, D. D. late Lord Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, deprived.

Christian Perfection, consisting in the Love of God ; explained in several Letters to a Lady, &c. written originally in Italian by Cardinal Petrucci ; now render'd into English : With an Account of the Author.

Characters



Characters and Criticisms upon the Ancient and Modern Orators, Poets, Painters, Musicians, Statuaries, and other Arts and Sciences; with an Heroick Poem in Blank Verse, entituled, The Age of *Lewis the Great*; written originally in *French* by the Archbishop of *Cambray*, and made *English* by Captain *Bladen*.

Practical Phonography, or the new Art of rightly Spelling and Writing Words by the Sound thereof; and of rightly Sounding and Reading Words by the Sight thereof, applied to the *English* Tongue. Design'd for the Use of the Duke of *Gloucester*. By *J. Jones*, M. D.

The Mysteries of Opium reveal'd, by Dr. *John Jones*, Chancellor of *Landaff*, a Member of the College of Physicians in *London*, and formerly Fellow of *Jesus College* in *Oxford*; who, 1. Gives an Account of the Name, Mark, Choice, Effects, &c. of Opium. 2. Proves all former Opinions of its Operations to be meer Chimera's. 3. Demonstrates what its true Cause is, by which he easily and mechanically explains all, even its most mysterious Effects. 4. Shews its noxious Principle, and how to separate it; thereby rendring it a safe and noble Panacea; whereof, 5. He shews the palliative and curative Use.

Advertisements from *Parnassus*, written originally in *Italian*, by the famous *Trajano Boccalini*, newly done into *English*, and adapted to the present Times: Together with the Author's Political Touchstone, never before translated: And an Account of his Life, in 3 Vol. By Captain *Martin Bladen*.

*Secretaria di Apollo*, or Letters from *Apollo*, Historical and Political; directed to the most eminent Princes, and Statesmen, and Politicians, in the World, as well Ancient as Modern. With curious Remarks on the Classic Authors, and other *Greek* and *Latin* Historians, in 2 Vol. By the famous *Trajano Boccalini*, now done into *English* by Captain *Martin Bladen*.



*The End.*























